CHURCH

AND ITS MOST BASIC ELEMENT

Edited by

PAUL PALLATH

HERDER

CHURCH
AND ITS MOST BASIC ELEMENT

Edited by
PAUL PALLATH

Herder Editrice e Libreria
International Book Center

Rome 1995

Title: **CHURCH**
AND ITS MOST BASIC ELEMENT

Editor: Paul PALLATH

Imprimatur: Remigio Ragonesi, Vicegerente
Dal Vicariato di Roma, 10.3.1995

Published by: Herder Editrice e Libreria

Distributed by: Herder Editrice e Libreria
International Book Center
Piazza Montecitorio, 120
Tel. 67.94.628
Roma - Italia

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, in any manner without the permission in writing from the copyright holder.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abbreviations vii

Introduction
Paul Pallath 1

1. The Eucharist Makes the Church: An Orthodox Proposal and its Impact
Edward G. Farrugia 13

2. Liturgy Makes the Church - Towards a Catholic Sacramental Ecclesiology
Paul Pallath 51

3. Church as Tradition
Joseph Powathil 91

4. Life of Our Life - Understanding Liturgy
Cuthbert Johnson 107

5. Liturgy and Spiritual Life or Liturgical Spirituality?
Achille M. Triacca 117

6. Church *Sui Iuris*, Ethos and Moral Theology
Basilio Petrà 161

8. Liturgical Norms in the Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches
Dimitri Salachas 179

Conclusion
Paul Pallath 203

Our Authors 209

ABBREVIATIONS

AAS	*Acta Apostolicae Sedis.*
AG	*Ad Gentes*, Decree on the Church's Missionary Activity.
Ap. Const.	Apostolic Constitution.
CA	*Centesimus Annus,* Encyclical letter of Pope John Paul II on the hundredth anniversary of *Rerum Novarum*, 1 May, 1991.
CCEO	*Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium.*
CD	*Christus Dominus*, Decree on the Bishop's Pastoral Office in the Church.
CEI	Conferenza Episcopale Italiana.
CIC	*Codex Iuris Canonici* 1983.
CSCO	*Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium,* Louvain.
CT	*Catechesi Tradendae,* The catechetical document of Pope John Paul II on 16 October, 1979.
DG	*Dignitas Humanae*, Declaration on Religious Freedom.
EV	*Enchiridion Vaticanum,* 1-12, edizioni Dehoniane, Bologna 1876-1992.
FC	*Familiaris Consortio,* Encyclical letter of Pope John Paul II on Christian Family, 22 November, 1981.
LG	*Lumen Gentium*, Dogmatic Constitution on the Church.
Litt. Apost.	Litterae Apostolicae.
LTK	*Lexicon für Theologie und Kirche.*
MANSI	J. D. MANSI, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio,* vols. 53, Florentiae-Parisiis 1901-1927.

NDL	*Nuovo Dizionario di Liturgia* , edited by D. Satore & A.M. Triacca, Roma 1984, 1990.
NEC	*New Catholic Encyclopedia.*
Nuntia	*Nuntia*, (Pontificia Commissio Codici Iuris Cononici Recognescendo) vols. 31, Citta del Vaticano, 1975-1990.
OCA	*Orientalia Christiana Analecta.*
OCP	*Orientalia Christiana Periodica.*
OE	*Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, Decree on the Catholic Oriental Churches.
OIRSI	Oriental Institute of Religious Studies in India.
PASA	Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo, Rome.
Periodica	*Periodica de re Morali, Canonica, Liturgica.*
PG	J. P. MIGNE, *Patrologiae cursus completus*, Series Graeca, 161 volumes, Parisiis 1857-1866.
PIO	Pontificio Istituto Orientale, Rome.
PL	J. P. MIGNE, *Patrologiae cursus completus*, Series Latina, 217 volumes, Parisiis 1878-1890.
Rmis.	*Redemptoris Missio,* encyclical letter of pope John Paul II, 7 December, 1990.
SA	*Slavorum Apostoli,* Encyclical Epistle of Pope John Paul II, 2 June , 1985.
SC	*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy.
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.*
UR	*Unitatis Redintegratio*, Decree on Ecumenism.
VJTR	*Vidyajyoti Journal of Theological Reflection.*
WCC	World Council of Churches.

INTRODUCTION

In the documents of Vatican II, the concept of particular Church as applied to the oriental Churches is theologically very rich.[1] A particular Church is always viewed as a community of Christian faithful, having its own liturgical, theological, spiritual and disciplinary heritage.

The dogmatic constitution on the Church *Lumen Gentium* no. 23 states: "It has come out through divine providence that, in course of time, different Churches set up in various places by the apostles and their successors joined together in a multiplicity of organically united groups which, whilst safeguarding the unity of the faith and the unique divine structure of the universal Church, have their own discipline, enjoy their own liturgical usage and inherit a theological and spiritual patrimony".

According to *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, "The holy Catholic Church, which is the mystical body of Christ, is made up of the faithful who are organically united in the Holy Spirit by the same faith, the same sacraments and the same government. They combine into different groups, which are held together by their hierarchy and so form particular Churches or rites" (OE 2). These particular Churches both Eastern and Western, while they differ somewhat among themselves in what is called "rite", namely in liturgy, in ecclesiastical discipline and in spiritual tradition, are none the less all equally entrusted to the pastoral guidance of the Roman Pontiff..." (OE 3).

Similarly *Unitatis Redintegratio* accepts the existence of different non-Catholic particular Churches in the East, having a great treasury from which the "West has drawn largely for its

---

[1] In the Vatican II documents *Ecclesia particularis* is also used for dioceses or eparchies; cf. LG 3b, 36a, 23, 27; CD 11.

liturgy, spiritual tradition and jurisprudence" (UR 14). It also declares that the "entire heritage of spirituality and liturgy, of discipline and theology of the various traditions belongs to the full catholic and apostolic character of the Church" (UR 17).

Accordingly a particular Church is always viewed as a community of Christian faithful having a specific liturgical, theological, spiritual and disciplinary heritage which distinguishes a Church from other Churches and which constitutes its specific identity and individuality. Western scholars also understood a particular Church in this sense. Speaking about the episcopal conferences J. H. Provost points out that the characteristics of a particular Church of the East are now discernible to a certain extent also in the West: "*Discipline* is being adapted even to the extent of juridical procedures. *Liturgical usage* is now modified to the language and customs of the people. Certain *theological and spiritual insights* characteristic of various cultures can now be discerned. In short, *those elements which characterize* a particular Church are now discernible in the ambiance of episcopal conferences".[2] Similarly commenting on LG 23, Karl Rahner writes:

> It is to be noted that though only formulated as a historical observation, the first sentence of the section involves an important principle, since the historical findings are regarded as marking a special divine providence. It affects particularly the Latin or Western branch of the Catholic Church because this has in fact been practically identified with the Church as a whole. Major Churches with *their own discipline, their own liturgy and their own spiritual and theological heritage* could also be formed in the future, by 'divine providence', say in Africa, Asia or South America.[3]

---

[2] J. H. PROVOST, "Structuring the Church as a *Communio*", *The Jurist* 36 (1976) 237.

[3] K. RAHNER, "The Hierarchical Structure of the Church, with Special Reference to Episcopate", in H. Vorgrimler, ed., *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, vol. 1, New York 1967, 207.

This immensely rich concept of particular Church in the documents of Vatican II is substituted by the purely juridical term *Ecclesia sui iuris* in *Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium.*[4] The Code describes *Ecclesia sui iuris* in the following manner:

> A community of the Christian faithful, which is joined together by a hierarchy according to the norm of law and which is expressly or tacitly recognized as *sui iuris* by the supreme authority of the Church, is called in this code a Church *sui iuris.*[5]

According to this description, the different constitutive elements of a Church are the following:

1. A community of Christian faithful: The description of a Church as a community of Christian faithful agrees with the documents of Vatican II which see the Church as the people of God.[6] The code presupposes the existence of a community of Christian faithful and does not seem to be bothered about the most fundamental and existential question: how a Christian Community comes into being? What actually makes a Christian community? Similarly the code is silent about the quality and quantity of a community of Christian faithful to be recognized as a Church. What constitutes the internal essential divine nature of a Church? What is the criterion for a community of Christian faithful to be established as a Church? How many Christian faithful are needed in order that a Christian community may be

---

[4] The concept *Ecclesia sui iuris*, though familiar to some canonists in Rome, is unknown to the majority of bishops, priests, religious and Christian faithful of the Catholic Church. For example this term never occurs in the *Catechism of the Catholic Church.* It is also very difficult to find a suitable translation for *Ecclesia sui iuris.*

[5] CCEO c. 27 - Coetus christifidelium hierarchia ad normam iuris iunctus, quem ut sui iuris expresse vel tacite agnoscit suprema Ecclesiae auctoritas, vocatur in hoc Codice Ecclesia sui iuris.

[6] *Lumen Gentium*, 9-16.

recognized as a patriarchal, major archiepiscopal, metropolitan or other Church *sui iuris*?[7]

2. Hierarchy: According to the canon the Church is a Christian community joined together by a hierarchy. Basing on the description of the Code some have gone so far as to affirm that hierarchy makes the Church. Prof. George Nedungatt writes: "Hierarchy here is viewed from a hylomorphic angle as the unifying *form* of the Christian faithful".[8] The Aristotelian-Scholastic hylomorphism distinguishes two elements in any being, the material element and the formal element. The matter has indefinite *potency,* and it is the *form* that makes a being to be this particular being. Applied to the Church, the community of Christian faithful is the material element and hierarchy is the *form* that makes the Church. Therefore hierarchy forms a community of Christian faithful into a Church *sui iuris.* Thus there is no wonder that some have arrived at the conclusion: "the persons with sacred powers holding office in the Church form the hierarchy of the Church. This hierarchy joins together the individual members of the People of God and makes it the Church".[9]

Such quasi identification of hierarchy with the Church is pre-Vatican and dangerous. According to Vatican II and both codes of canon law, Church is the people of God and members of the hierarchy also essentially belong to the people of God. In other words hierarchy is also 'part and parcel' of the community

---

[7] According to the Code these are the four possible forms of Churches. Though the dignity and greatness of a Church cannot be determined counting heads, from a sociologico-phenomenological perspective the number of Christian faithful is also important.

[8] G. NEDUNGATT, "A New Code for the Oriental Churches", VJTR 55 (1991) 330; See also *The Spirit of the Eastern Code,* Bangalore-Rome,1993, 72; Cf. also A. VALIYAVILAYIL, "The Notion of *Sui Iuris* Church", in J. Chiramel ed., *The Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches: A Study and Interpretation,* Rome 1992, 68.

[9] A. VALIYAVILAYIL, "The Notion of *Sui Iuris* Church", 66.

of Christian faithful. In virtue of baptism in Christ there exists among all the Christian faithful a true equality with regard to dignity and the activity whereby all cooperate in the building up of the Body of Christ in accord with each one's own condition and function.[10] Some Christian faithful are called by Christ and consecrated by the Holy Spirit to serve the Church through their ministry.[11] The ordination and consecration of some do not mean their elevation over nor separation from the Christian faithful; they remain within the Christian community in virtue of baptism.

The recent magisterium of the Church is very clear and distinct about the role of hierarchy in the Church. Hierarchy is viewed as a service for the communion. According to LG no. 24, "that office, however, which the Lord committed to the pastors of his people, is, in the strict sense of the term, a service, which is called very expressively in Sacred Scripture a *diakonia* or ministry". "The main thrust of this service or *diakonia* is for more and more communion or fellowship to be generated in the whole Church body, and for this communion to thrive and produce good results".[12] The apostolic constitution *Pastor Bonus* clearly accentuates the ministerial character of hierarchy:

> The power and authority of the bishops bears the mark of *diakonia* or stewardship, fitting the example of Jesus Christ himself who 'came not to be served, but to serve

---

[10] Cf. CCEO c. 11, the corresponding canon in CIC, c. 208.

[11] *Catechism of the Catholic Church* calls Holy Orders as a Sacrament at the service of the communion Cf. p. 343; Even the Pope remains within the community of Christian faithful. And the papacy, more than a dignity, is a service. "It emphasizes the duties of the Pope in the Church, his *Petrine ministry,* carried out for the good of the Church and the faithful. St. Gregory the Great understood this perfectly when, out of all the titles connected to the functions of the Bishop of Rome, he preferred that of *Servus servorum Dei* (Servant of the servants of God)", Pope JOHN PAUL II, *Crossing the Threshold of Hope*, London 1994, 13.

[12] Pope JOHN PAUL II, Ap. Const. *Pastor Bonus*, 29 June 1988, AAS 80 (1988) 841.

> and to give his life as a ransom for many' (Mk. 10: 45). Therefore the power that is found in the Church is to be understood as the power of being a servant and is to be exercised in that way; before anything else it is the authority of a shepherd.[13]

Catechism of the Catholic Church repeats: "Intrinsically linked to the sacramental nature of ecclesial ministry is *its character as service.* Entirely dependent on Christ who gives mission and authority, ministers are truly 'slaves of Christ', in the image of him who freely took 'the form of a slave' for us. Because the word and grace of which they are ministers are not their own, but are given to them by Christ for the sake of others, they must freely become the slaves of all".[14] Hierarchy is only a quality of the Church and not the Church. Therefore we say that Church is hierarchical, but we never say that Church is hierarchy or hierarchy makes the Church. As we have seen above, hierarchy is a service for the Church and from within the Church.

According to the norm of law a hierarchy can be headed by a patriarch, major archbishop, or a metropolitan.[15] But the code gives no criterion regarding the nature and size of a hierarchy. How many dioceses or bishops are needed in order that a community of Christian faithful may be recognized as a patriarchal, major archiepiscopal or a metropolitan *sui iuris* Church?

3. Explicit or tacit recognition of the supreme authority of the Church: According to our description the third element necessary for a Church is recognition by the supreme authority of the Church, namely the Pope or ecumenical council. But it is not the recognition that makes a Church. The Church exists first and then comes the recognition, because nothingness cannot be recognized. According to history, the Churches of Rome,

---

[13] Ap. Const. *Pastor Bonus*, AAS 80 (1988) 843.

[14] *Catechism of the Cathollic Church*, no. 876; cf. LG 18.

[15] See CCEO, cc. 55-176.

Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem and Constantinople existed first and then gradually they obtained the recognition of the supreme authority of the Church.[16] Therefore recognition means the acknowledgement of an already existing Church as a patriarchal, major archiepiscopal or metropolitan Church, but it is not the recognition that makes a Church.[17] Again the code does not give any objective criterion for this recognition.[18]

The Church *sui iuris* as described in the Oriental Code is comparable to any religious congregation or charitable organization or even to a political party like the Christian democratic parties of Italy, Germany and other European countries. The three elements which the code proposes for a Church can be discernible in an analogical manner also in a Christian political party. A Christian political party has a group of Christian faithful who believes in the same ideology and programme as its members. This group is also joined together by a head, and there exists a hierarchy of power structures from top to bottom that organizes the party in an effective manner in different levels. A political party has also the recognition of the supreme authority according to the constitution of each nation. In short, separating a Church from its liturgical, theological, spiritual, disciplinary heritage (rite) and thus evacuating the divine, mystical, sacramental dimensions, the *Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium* has reduced a Church to a mere

---

[16] See, Council of Nicaea (325) cc. 6 & 7; Council of Constantinople (381) cc. 2 & 3; Council of Chalcedon cc. 9, 17 & 28; See also P. PALLATH, The *Synod of Bishops of Catholic Oriental Churches*, Rome 1994, 105-109.

[17] The Syro-Indian Church (wrongly called Syro-Malabar Church) existed from from the first century owing to the apostolate of St.Thomas. But it obtained the explicit recognition of the supreme authority of the Church as a major archiepiscopal Church according to the spirit of the code only in 1992. See Ap. Const. Quae maiori AAS 85 (1993) 398-399.

[18] *Nuntia* 28 (1989) 19.

juridical institution that can be erected, modified or suppressed by the supreme authority of the Church.[19]

The exponents of the code themselves are conscious of the dangers involved in such reduction of a Church into a mere juridical institution. Prof. George Nedungatt brings into focus the problem: "It is important to note that Esi is a *canonical* term and as such is no adequate substitute for the *ecclesiological term particularis* used in OE. Esi looks at these Churches *ratione iuris*, that is, from the juridical angle (*sui iuris*) only. This is a canonical reduction, legitimate in canon law, but fraught with danger if carried over into ecclesiology".[20] He writes again that the conciliar term *Ecclesia particularis* in the sense of OE "cannot be substituted in *ecclesiology* with a juridical term Esi, which expresses only one aspect of ecclesial life, namely the juridical aspect and leaves out others equally or even more important as the liturgical, spiritual and the theological ones, which are constitutive of the identity of a Particular Church".[21] Prof. Ivan Žužek who was the secretary of the Pontifical Commission for the Revision of Oriental Canon Law, is also conscious that the richness and complexity of an *Ecclesia sui iuris* cannot be expressed by a mere juridical definition. To the critics of the definition he gives the following answer: "evidently, if the strictly juridical definition is lean, the reality of a Church *sui iuris* is so rich and complex that it is impossible to give it an adequate description".[22] Similarly according to J. D. Faris, "The use of the term *ecclesia sui iuris* in the CCEO is not without its

---

[19] CCEO c. 57 § 1, reads "The erection, restoration, modification and suppression of patriarchal Churches is reserved to the supreme authority of the Church". Cf. also c. 155 § 2.

[20] G. NEDUNGATT, "A New Code for the Oriental Churches", VJTR 55 (1991) 331. 'Esi' is the short form used by the author for *Ecclesia sui iuris*. Italics as in the original.

[21] G. NEDUNGATT, *The Spirit of the Eastern Code*, 216.

[22] I. Žu žek, "Presentazione del 'Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium'", *Monitor Ecclesiasticus* 115 (1990) 601.

detractors since it is restricted to only the one facet of the nature of these Churches, their juridic stature and the realities of their spiritual, theological and liturgical traditions, which also contribute to the identity of these Churches are ignored".[23] Others who commented this canon also realize the dangers involved in such a juridical approach to the complex reality of Church and always try to connect the Church with its liturgy, theology and spirituality that constitute its distinctive identity and individuality.[24]

The lazarisation of the concept of Church has reached its zenith with the creation of an entirely new species of Churches, called "other *sui iuris* Churches", hitherto unknown in the canonical tradition of the Christian Orient. Canon 174 describes in the following manner the nature of these new species of Churches: "A Church *sui iuris,* which is neither patriarchal nor major archiepiscopal nor metropolitan, is entrusted to a hierarch who presides over it in accordance with the norm of common law and the particular law established by the Roman Pontiff".[25]

The canon shows that this type of Church is entrusted to a "hierarch". According to Canon Law many persons who are not bishops can be hierarchs. Therefore a *sui iuris* Church can exist even without a single bishop.[26] But the whole tradition of the

---

[23] J. D. FARIS, *Eastern Catholic Churches: Constitution and Governance*, New York 1992, 144.

[24] Cf. D. SALACHAS, *Istituzioni di diritto canonico delle Chiese cattoliche orientali*, Roma-Bologna 1993, 66-67; BASILIO PETRÀ, "Church *sui iuris*, Ethos and Moral Theology" in this book.

[25] CCEO c. 174-Ecclesia sui iuris, quae est patriarchalis nec archiepiscopalis maior nec metropolitana, concreditur Hierarchae, qui ei praeest ad normam iuris communis et iuris particularis a Romano Pontifice statuti.

[26] CCEO c. 984 §1. Besides the Roman Pontiff the following are hierarchs: first of all the patriarch, the major archbishop, the metropolitan who presides over a metropolitan Church *sui iuris*, and the eparchial bishop, as well as those who succeed these in the interim governance in accordance with the norm of law.

Church, both oriental and occidental, witnesses that the presence of a bishop is necessary even for the basic ecclesial cell and therefore only a diocese or eparchy is considered as the basic unit of the Church.[27] Only the bishop who is the successor of the apostles can guarantee the apostolicity of his Church and connect his Church with the apostolic Faith and apostolic Tradition. Referring to the testimony of St. Irenaeus, Vatican II states that "the apostolic tradition is manifested and preserved in the whole world by those who were made bishops by the apostles and by their successors down to our own time".[28] But the concept of Church is so impoverished in the oriental code that a *sui iuris* Church can exist even without a single bishop. It is very easy to form a *sui iuris* Church if there is a hierarch and a small group of Christian faithful.[29] Moreover, the concept *Ecclesia sui iuris* (autonomous Church) is itself a contradiction in terms, at least with regard to these Churches because its autonomy is on a par with that of an ordinary eparchy or diocese. The hierarch who heads it is immediately subject to the Holy see, like the Latin

---

§2. Besides the Roman Pontiff the following are local hierarchs: the eparchial bishop, the exarch, the apostolic administrator, as well as those who in their absence lawfully succeed them in the interim governance, also the protosyncellus and the syncellus ....

§3. The major superiors in institutes of consecrated life who have ordinary power of governance are also hierarchs, but not local hierarchs. Cf. CIC c. 134.

[27] Cf. P. PALLATH, *The Synod of Bishops of Catholic Oriental Churches*, Rome 1994, 48-49.

[28] *Lumen Gentium*, 20.

[29] Thus for example the Belorussian Church has about 30, 000 faithful, for whom a bishop is appointed as a visitor; the Bulgarian Church has 15000 faithful under an apostolic exarch; the Greek Church 2300 faithful under a bishop; the Albanian Church has a few hundred Christian faithful and an apostolic administrator; the Russian Church has about 1000 Christian faithful under two exarchates. Cf. J. D. FARIS, *Catholic Eastern Churches: Constitution and Governance*, 54-63; V. J. POSPISHIL, *Eastern Catholic Church Law*, New York 1993, 15-22.

diocesan bishop. Its autonomy is hardly different from the autonomy of any other eparchy.[30]

We met with a multitude of problems in this introduction. But the following questions are very important: What makes a Church? What is the most basic element of a Church? This book tries to answer these questions which may include directly or indirectly the responses to other problems. Without any initial comment about the articles, we leave the readers free to go through the book in order to arrive at the end with a proper response to the fundamental questions which we have posed.

Paul Pallath

[30] Cf. G. NEDUNGATT, *The Spirit of the Eastern Code*, 96-97.

"THE EUCHARIST MAKES THE CHURCH"
An Orthodox Proposal and Its Impact*

Edward G. Farrugia, SJ

Although the Church has been reflecting on her nature ever since her inception, the treatise on the Church remains to this day unfinished.[1] The spectacular success reserved for "eucharistic ecclesiology" in our times, like a stray comet which illuminates and changes a whole landscape, may well provide an explanation. The Church is a many-splendoured reality in which there meet God and man, saint and sinner, believer and citizen, congregation and society, so that Church may be approached from these various angles, each ultimately leading to the heart of

---

* Abbreviations:

AFANAS'EV, "Dve idei vselenskoj tserkvi" = N.N. AFANAS'EV, "Dve idei vselenskoj tserkvi" *Put'*, 45 (1934) 16-29.

MCPARTLAN = P. MCPARTLAN, *The Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue*, Edinburgh 1993.

J. MEYENDORFF (ed.), *The Primacy of Peter* = J. MEYENDORFF (ed.), *The Primacy of Peter*, in part translated from the French, Crestwood, N. York 1992.

NICHOLS = A. NICHOLS, *Theology in the Russian Diaspora*, Cambridge 1989.

PLANK = P. PLANK, *Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche. Die Entstehung und Entfaltung der eucharistischen Ekklesiologie Nikolaj Afanas'evs (1893-1966)*, Würzburg 1980.

B. SCHULTZE, "Eucharistie und Kirche" = B. SCHULTZE, "Eucharistie und Kirche in der russischen Theologie der Gegenwart," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 77 (1955) 257-300.

J. ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion* = J. ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion* London 1985.

[1] St Cyprian's "De Catholicae Ecclesiae Unitate" (251) has been called the first treatise on the Church, but St Ignatius of Antioch's aphorisms at the end of the first century or the beginning of the second may have done more to impart permanent orientation to the treatise on the Church, as contemporary discussions on the Church go to show.

the same mystery. No doubt, the fascination exercised by eucharistic ecclesiology partly lies in its succinct formula, "the Church makes the Eucharist, and the Eucharist makes the Church," which seems to lay bare that very mystery. Like the pithy sayings of the Presocratics it says more than many a learned tome. In a way, it says everything about the Church. But: does it say enough?

In the present study the accent lies on this remarkable ecclesiological initiative which a number of Orthodox theologians developed in this century. We shall thus try to (1) first briefly sketch the origins of eucharistic ecclesiology in Nikolaj Afanas'ev (1893-1966), (2) then its subsequent development at the hands of Alexander Schmemann (1921-1983), John Meyendorff (1926-1992) and John Zizioulas (1931-). (3) The critical evaluation, limited to a few Orthodox and Catholic reactions, does not aim at offering an alternative Catholic proposal, but wants to bring the Orthodox proposal itself into focus through differentiated assessments from various perspectives, in order to show its ecumenical potential as well as its limits.

1. An Orthodox Ecclesiology

It might come as a surprise to those accustomed to associate eucharistic ecclesiology with Afanas'ev that the saying "the Church makes the Eucharist, and the Eucharist makes the Church" does not stem from him at all. Bernard Sesboüé recounts how he came across the saying attributed quite a number of times to the Fathers.[2] It was, however, not an Eastern theologian who coined it, but Henri de Lubac (1896-1991). In so doing, the latter pointed out the causal interrelationship between Eucharist and the Church:

> Each has been entrusted to the other, so to speak, by Christ; the Church produces the Eucharist, but the Eucharist also produces the Church. In the first instance

[2] B. SESBOÜÉ, "Eucharistie: deux générations de travaux," *Etudes* 355 (1981) 101.

> the Church is involved in her active aspect (...) -- in the exercise of her sanctifying power; in the second case she is involved in her passive aspect, as the Church of the sanctified. But in the last analysis it is the one Body which builds itself up through this mysterious interaction in and through the conditions of our present existence up to the day of its consummation.[3]

The fact that the axiom under consideration was first pronounced by a Catholic should not make us ignore that most of the fundamental ideas usually associated with it had been already developed in an independent way by Nikolaj Afanas'ev.

1.1. Eucharistic and Universal Ecclesiologies

Dealing with matters of faith, ultimately wrapped up in mystery, definitions are hardly ever the best means of approaching them. Strictly speaking, definitions are never an ideal means at all to fathom ultimate realities, not even in philosophical debate, but only a pragmatic device to extricate oneself out of a difficulty by drawing lines for future discussion. The best way of approaching mysteries would be, then, given the unity of dogma and spirituality, to trace the experience one makes with them in the Spirit, a living correlate to the contents of dogma. The articulation of dogma itself is a painful process of cognizance, which often comes close to tearing the Church up into factions, a process which the Church cannot avoid, simply because it has the obligation to pronounce itself on the deposit of faith entrusted to her.

Since, consequently, some description of the issue at stake is unavoidable, we may as well start by describing "eucharistic ecclesiology." Actually, it would be better to say, right away, eucharistic ecclesiolog*ies*; for in the meantime there are variants of the same basic idea which are not only sometimes at odds with each other on various counts but which even cut

---

[3] H. de LUBAC, *The Splendour of the Church*. Translated by M. Mason, N. York 1956, pp. 92-93. As the dictum is usually reported, "produces" is generally changed, in both cases, to "makes."

across confessional lines.[4] With this in mind, we may say that eucharistic ecclesiology, at least in the intent of N. Afanas'ev, who originated it, is usually contradistinguished from universal ecclesiology. The former sees the fullness of Church finding expression in the eucharistic liturgy of the local Church gathered around its bishop, whereas the latter sees the plenitude of Church in the episcopate as a whole.[5]

1.2. Two Parallel Developments That Meet: N. Afanas'ev and H. de Lubac

1.2.1. N. Afanas'ev's Priority of Proposal (1934)

One of the Catholic scholars who carried on a serious dialogue with N. Afanas'ev was B. Schultze, SJ, who has the pioneer's merit of having made him better known in Western circles. Though Schultze dedicated a number of articles to the issue,[6] an effort which yielded precious services to those who touched the same topic after him, he himself overlooked[7] a 1934 article by N. Afanas'ev, which contains *in nuce* the latter's whole idea except for the very terms of "universal ecclesiology" and "eucharistic ecclesiology". And yet, this article helps relativize many claimants to possible influences on Afanas'ev.[8] On the

---

[4] A. Nichols mentions, on Orthodox side, P. Evdokimov, J. Meyendorff and J. Zizioulas; on Catholic side, H. de Lubac, Y. Congar, J. Hamer, L. Bouyer, H.-J. Schulz, J. Ratzinger and B. Forte; NICHOLS 175.

[5] N. AFANAS'EV, "The Church Which Presides In Love," in J. Meyendorff (ed.), *The Primacy of Peter*, pp. 92, 109.

[6] See, for example, B. SCHULTZE, "Ecclesiologia universale o eucaristica?," *Unitas* 20 (1965/1) 14-33; "Der Primat Petri und seiner Nachfolger nach den Grundsätzen der universellen und der eucharistischen Ekklesiologie" OCP 31 (1965) 21-52, 277-294; and especially "Ekklesiologischer Dialog mit Erzpriester Nikolaj Afanas'ev" OCP 33 (1967) 380-403.

[7] See, for example, B. SCHULTZE, "Eucharistie und Kirche," 264, and: idem, "Der Primat Petri und seiner Nachfolger nach den Grundsätzen der universellen und der eucharistischen Ekklesiologie," OCP 31 (1965) 21.

[8] PLANK 123.

other hand, one cannot deny elements which, in one way or another, helped shape Afanas'ev's viewpoint. Among such influences may be reckoned John of Kronstadt (1829-1908), whose promotion of frequent communion served generally as a stimulus for a more Eucharist-orientated ecclesiology, an impulse which S. Cetverikov (1867-1947) adopted in his writing, albeit in a general and not particularly discerning way.[9] But the list would be too long to discuss; A. Nichols discusses Afanas'ev in relationship to N.A. Berdiaev (1874-1948),[10] S.N. Bulgakov (1871-1944)[11] and G.V. Florovskii (1893-1979).[12]

1.2.2. H. de Lubac's Suggestion of a Sacramental Ecclesiology

The title of this article is part of a saying found in de Lubac's *Méditation sur l'Eglise.*[13] Although his much earlier *Catholicisme* (1938) does not contain the saying, it may nonetheless be interpreted as an extended comment on the second part of the saying, "the Eucharist makes the Church". At the heart of this "programatic"[14] writing was de Lubac's insight into the havoc which the rise of scholasticism wrought by severing the treatise on the Church from that of the sacraments. Steeped in the Fathers, especially in the sacramental vision of life

---

[9] B. SCHULTZE, "Eucharistie und Kirche," 261; PLANK 71, 124.

[10] NICHOLS 135-145.

[11] Ibid., pp. 145-153.

[12] Ibid., p. 153.

[13] Ibid., Paris 1953, pp. 115-116. The text merits to be cited in the original: "Tous prient humblement le Seigneur, 'Maître de la paix et de la concorde,' pour son Eglise sainte et catholique. Ils lui demandent de la pacifier, de la garder, de l'unifier et de la régir, sur toute la surface de la terre. C'est le début du canon de la messe, l'introduction à l'instant sacré où l'Eglise s'apprête à *faire l'Eucharistie.* ... Mais, si le sacrifice est accepté à Dieu, si la prière de l'Eglise est exaucée, c'est qu'à son tour, au sens le plus strict, l'Eucharistie *fait l'Eglise.*" In this context, de Lubac calls the Eucharist "sacrement des sacrements" (ibid., p. 112), but adds that the Eucharist completes what baptism has started (ibid., p. 116).

[14] H.U.v. BALTHASAR, "The Achievement of Henri de Lubac," *Thought* 51 (1976) 12.

so salient in Origen (ca 185- ca 254) and St Augustine (354-430), de Lubac elaborated a modern patristic synthesis to counter such effects of scholastic thought as weakened the intrinsic link between symbol (sacrament) and symbolized. As is well-known, de Lubac's *Surnaturel*[15] reacted against the two-storey view of the reality of nature and grace, as if they related neutrally to one another, without a mutual inner affinity, a view which ultimately harks back to Juan Ripalda (1594-1648). The latter, in turn, had drawn this distinction between nature and grace to counter Michel Baius (1513-89), who had insisted that the supernatural (grace) somehow belonged to humans by nature. But already in *Catholicisme* de Lubac sharply criticized the reduction of eucharistic piety to mere eucharistic devotion. The latter could prove satisfactory only if it went hand in hand with devotion to the *corpus Christi mysticum.*[16]

Against this deviation de Lubac pointed to the need for communion. Indeed, de Lubac gives a eucharistic interpretation to the famous Augustinian dictum, "Nec tu me in te mutabis, sicut cibum carnis tuae, sed tu mutaberis in me",[17] whose context was originally not that of the Eucharist, but that of St Augustine's growing familiarization with the Word of God in prayer.[18]

The Eucharist makes the Church. Even the Church's use of the "I" leaves no scope for centrifugal tendencies, but finds its justification as a response to Christ, the real "I" of the Church

---

[15] Paris 1946.

[16] H. de LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, Paris (7th ed.) 1983, pp. 46-51, 63-78, 299, 317.

[17] One of the many variants in St Augustine runs as follows: "Cibus sum grandium: cresce et manducabis me. nec tu me in te mutabis sicut cibum carnis tuae, sed tu mutaberis in me;" Bibliothèque Augustinienne, Oeuvres de Saint Augustin, *Les Confessions* VII, x, 141, 9-12, Desclée de Brouwer 1962. "I am the nourishment of the mature: grow up and you will eat me. Nor will you change me into yourself, like the nourishment of your body; but it is you who will be changed into me" (my translation).

[18] MCPARTLAN 67-68.

being ultimately Christ himself.[19] And the Church makes the Eucharist. This broaches the topic of the role of the bishop and of the relationship that should obtain between the universal Church and the particular Churches. In both instances we are referred to the community.

1.2.3. N. Afanas'ev: Foreshadowings and Convergences

Part of the paradox of eucharistic ecclesiology is its claim to have produced an all-inclusive schema of the Church, reducing all ecclesiologies into two basic types: eucharistic and universal. Such a claim could only be advanced if accompanied with a hermeneutics of history, since eucharistic ecclesiology itself seemed, for all intents and purposes, to have started with Afanas'ev. But the adepts of this ecclesiology could appeal to present but not vibrant chords in the equation. It was thus pointed out that St Paul's image of the "body of Christ" was by no means primarily a sociological image of a cohesive body of Christians gathered together around the altar of the Lord, but a reflection on the liturgy as liturgy.[20] In this way, an image was exploited in its typically Oriental valency as a means of avoiding abstract speculation by concentrating on liturgical operations as such.[21]

In spite of this it cannot be denied that, although the credit goes to Afanas'ev, the idea that the Church finds its full expression in the eucharistic liturgy had already been articulated, for example, by G. Florovskij. In his "Evkharistija i Sobornost'" Florovskij had expressed himself as follows:

> In the Eucharist there is unveiled, invisibly but really, the fullness of the Church. Each liturgy is celebrated in union with the whole Church, *so vseiu Tserkov'iu*, and, so to speak, in its name, *ot eia litsa* not just in the name of those who are present. For every little Church,

---

[19] MCPARTLAN 95.

[20] A. KALLIS, "Ekklesiologie V: Orthodoxe Kirche," *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* (1989) 18, 255.

[21] Ibid., p. 253.

> *malaia Tserkov'*, is not only a part, *chast'*, but a comprehensive image, *stiazhennyi obraz*, of the whole Church, inseparable from its unity and fullness. Therefore in each Liturgy, the whole Church is present and takes part - mysteriously but really. The liturgical celebration is in a certain sense a renewed incarnation of God. In it we glimpse the God-man, Christ, as founder and head of the Church - and with him the whole Church. In the prayer of the Eucharist the Church sees and acknowledges herself as the single and complete body of Christ.[22]

This brings to mind that the idea of completeness endemic to the Eucharist as bringing to the fore the plenitude of Church reality is cognate to sobornost itself. In the analysis of P. Plank, the ecclesiologies of both Afanas'ev and Florovskij have a common origin.[23] Again, that Afanas'ev was not the only one to see in St Cyprian the originator of the idea of the universal episcopate may be gauged from N. Zernov,[24] although the latter does not discuss the relationship of Eucharist and Church.

Nor can it be denied that Afanas'ev belongs to the same tradition which, starting with A. Khomjakov (1804-1860), leads to a reception in its qualitative rather than its quantitative dimension.[25] And while Afanas'ev did not have the aptitude to develop S. Bulgakov's speculative thinking, such as sophiology, nonetheless it would seem that it was Bulgakov, among others, who opened Afanas'ev's eyes for the soteriological,

---

22 G. FLOROVSKIJ, "Evkharistiya i Sobornost'," *Put'* 19 (1929) 3-22. Quoted in NICHOLS 161.

23 PLANK 124.

24 Ibid.; see N. ZERNOV, "Svjatoj Kiprian Karfagenskij i edinstvo Vselenskoj Tserkvi," *Put'* 39 (1933) 18-40.

25 For the idea of "reception" of a council see A. GRILLMEIER, *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche* 2/1, Freiburg i.Br. 1986, pp. 6-11. For the relationship between reception and catholicity see P.P. O'LEARY, *The Triune Church: A Study in the Ecclesiology of A.S. Xomjakov*, Dublin 1982, pp. 130-152.

pneumatological, eschatological and trinitarian ramifications of ecclesiology.[26]

Afanas'ev's relation to the Protestant Church historian R. Sohm (1841-1917) shows that he read critically the latter's thesis of the incompatibility of Church and law.[27]

1.2.4. N. Afanas'ev's Quantitative and Qualitative Ecclesiologies

Through his lifelong interest in canon-law,[28] one not severed from ecclesiology or pastoral involvement, but rather part and parcel of a living organism, Afanas'ev acquired an insight into the canonical structure of Christianity. It seemed to him that, if the original structures were to be retrieved -- structures not isolated from spirit, but spirit-bearing structures --, then one would have to look to primitive Christianity. This found expression in the 1934 article, "Dve idei vselenskoj tserkvi",[29] where Afanas'ev's basic insight is present *ante litteram*, that is to say, without the complementary concepts "eucharistic" and "universal ecclesiology". In the 1934 article, Afanas'ev distinguished between the "qualitative" ecclesiology of St Ignatius of Antioch and the "quantitative" ecclesiology of St Cyprian. In his viewpoint, whereas St Ignatius (e.g., Sm 8,2) builds his exegesis on the basis of Mt 18:20 ("Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in their midst"), Cyprian (e.g., Ep 55,24) basically though unwittingly misrepresented the

---

[26] PLANK 124-125.

[27] PLANK 65, 113-123.

[28] NICHOLS 75.

[29] *Put'* 45 (1934) 16-29; PLANK 49. Precisely on the basis of the analysis of this article Plank (ibid., pp.49-61) corrects Schultze's assumption that Afanas'ev had first launched his ecclesiology in his "Tainstva i tajnodejstvija" (Sacramenta et Sacramentalia), *Pravoslavnaja Mysl'* 8 (1951) 17-34. Afanas'ev's wife, Marianne, states that her husband had his first vision of eucharistic ecclesiology in the winter semester 1932-1933 when preparing for S. Bulgakov's seminar; M. Afanas'ev, "La genèse de *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*," in N. AFANAS'EV, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, Paris 1975, pp. 17-18.

Pauline ecclesiology, because he projected the categories of the Roman Empire onto the Church.[30]

St Ignatius interprets the Matthean saying thus: *"opou an phanei o episkopos, ekei to plethos esto, osper opou an ei Christos Iesous, ekei e katholike Ekklesia"*: "Where there is the bishop, let there be also the community, just as where Christ is there is the Catholic Church".[31] Since in the Old Testament God dwelt only in Sion, and since this is no longer the case, the Lord's presence in the gathering of two or three must be termed "eucharistic presence".[32] In the eucharistic offer Christ is fully present, a presence which is that of the *katholike ekklesia*, so that the eucharistic gathering is always the Catholic Church in its plenitude. This St Ignatius tried to condense in one phrase when he wrote: "Where there is the bishop, let there be the community" (Sm 8,2).[33] This brings to mind the interdependence of bishop and community, none of whom can operate without the other.[34]

The plenitude of the catholic Church in one eucharistic gathering presents a problem as to how it relates to the same plenitude in other eucharistic communities. Initially, according to Afanas'ev, "catholicity" meant spiritual abundance, available wherever Christ is present.[35] That in the various communities spiritual life flourishes undiminished is an expression of this communal bond of love.[36] No wonder that the awareness of ecclesial plenitude is a factor of cohesion among the various local Churches; Afanas'ev points out that Ignatius uses in part *ekklesia* and *agape* as synonyms.[37]

---

[30] PLANK 50.

[31] "Dve idei vselenskoj tserkvij," p. 25.

[32] Ibid., PLANK 50-51.

[33] PLANK 51-52.

[34] "Dve Idei vselenskoj tserkvi," p. 26.

[35] Ibid., pp. 26-27; PLANK 61.

[36] "Dve idei vselenskoj tserkvi," p. 27.

[37] Ibid., p. 27; PLANK 52.

For Cyprian, on the contrary, although a certain disharmony is found between his theory and his practice,[38] the fullness of the Church was found in the universal Church. To his mind, all bishops are the successors of Peter, but Rome has a special place. For this reason, Cyprian's theology, albeit inchoatively, had to lead to the full-fledged Roman claims of jurisdictional primacy. Unfortunately, it proved contagious for the East as well. From the limited idea of an eumenical council in the sense of a council within the limits of the Byzantine empire, it was only one step away to the idea of a universal council. In this way, not only were the claims of the imperial Church extended beyond the boundaries of the empire, but Rome and Constantinople came to contend, each in its own way, supremacy.[39] The Cyprian model would have destroyed the Church in the East as well were it not for the presence of a model of Church union which was never destroyed: that of *sobornost*.[40] If the eucharistic ecclesiology is only now coming again to the fore, this is due no doubt to the many recent upheavals in recent Church history.

The later explanations add greater clarity to Afanas'ev's idea of the primacy, especially through the 1960 article "The Church Which Presides In Love". There, for example, under the influence of O. Cullmann's research[41], Afanas'ev distinguishes between "primacy", a concept of universal ecclesiology which envisages the supremacy of one bishop over the whole Church, and "priority", which is tied to eucharistic ecclesiology and belongs to a local Church.[42]

---

[38] "Vse idei vselenskoj tserkvi," p. 19.

[39] Ibid., pp. 20-22.

[40] Ibid., p. 24.

[41] O. CULLMANN, *Saint-Pierre, disciple-apôtre-martyr*, Neuchâtel and Paris 1952.

[42] N. AFANAS'EV, "The Church Which Presides In Love," in: J. Meyendorff (ed.), *The Primacy of Peter*, p. 116.

But it is in his postumous work, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*,[43] that Afanas'ev has given us his definitive thought. In effect, looking retrospectively from this vantage-point, we see his thought emerging more clearly from certain methodological choices. Already the title, taken from the Tertullian of the Montanist period, would convince us that the inspiration of Afanas'ev's ecclesiology is pneumatological. Tertullian (c. 160-c. 220) is criticized for his sectarianism, but Afanas'ev considered him to be right in claiming that the only foundation the Church can have is the Spirit.[44] Maybe, however, G. Florovsky's strictures against a severing of the pneumatological and the christological dimensions of the Church, a criticism levelled against V. Lossky, was not lost on Afanas'ev, and he considers the Church insofar as it is a creation of the Spirit to be pneumatic or charismatic, but insofar as it was founded by Christ in the Last Supper to be eucharistic.[45] These two dimensions would yield, respectively, the priesthood of the faithful ("the royal priesthood") and the ministerial priesthood. But, although the apostolic Church did not distinguish between clergy and laity, this fundamental unity of the people of God came to be impaired especially after Tertullian's death, when Roman law contaminated the early Church.[46] The special ministerial consecration which ensued destroyed like a spade the unity of the body of the Church.[47] In the early Church, all con-celebrated,[48] even if only the *proestós* (president) assumed the presidency.[49] The move from the *proestós* to the bishop was accomplished because the other

---

[43] The Russian original, *Tserkov svatova ducha*, was published in 1971 in Paris; here we follow the Franch translation (Paris 1975) by M. Drobot.

[44] *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, p. 25.

[45] Ibid., pp. 27-29.

[46] Ibid., p. 26.

[47] Ibid., p. 47: "La doctrine de la consécration fut le glaive qui devait définitivement diviser le corps ecclésial."

[48] Ibid., p. 95.

[49] Ibid., p. 92.

ministries of apostle, evangelist, prophet disappeared.[50] This transformation went hand in hand with the shift from the primacy of love to that of law.[51] Consequently Afanas'ev suggests eliminating law and re-thinking Church from the viewpoint of the priesthood of the faithful.

2. Afanas'ev's Disciples

Afanas'ev's views were soon taken up by two of his disciples, A. Schmemann and J. Meyendorff. Common to both is the way they emphasized decidedly more than Afanas'ev the need of more bonds between the individual Churches.[52]

2.1. Alexander Schmemann

More than Afanas'ev Schmemann stressed the organic unity of the Church (not merely that of the Churches), a universal unity not safeguarded by simply saying that all the Churches together form one organism, but that each Church is the *same* Church or indivisible body of Christ.[53]

Schmemann was not simply Afanas'ev's disciple,[54] for the very formulation of eucharistic ecclesiology by Afanas'ev owed something to him. As Afanas'ev's student in Paris, Schmemann showed him passages from Gregory Dix, the Anglican Benedictine who wrote the classical study, *The Shape of the Liturgy*.[55] There Dix portrays the various eucharistic rites of the

---

[50] Ibid., pp. 188-189, 266-68.

[51] Ibid, pp. 361-363.

[52] Ch. FELMY, *Orthodoxe Theologie: Eine Einführung*, Darmstadt 1990, pp. 158-159.

[53] "The Idea of Primacy in Orthodox Ecclesiology," p. 155.

[54] Although Afanas'ev does not figure among Schmemann's teachers at Saint-Serge, Paris, such as Sergius Bulgakov, Anton Kartashev and Cyprian Kern, he exercised on Schmemann a decisive influence; Th. FISCH, "Schmemann's Theological Contribution to the Liturgical Renewal of the Churches," in Th. Fisch (ed.), *Liturgy and Tradition: Theological Reflections of Alexander Schmemann*, Crestwood, New York 1990, p. 4.

[55] G. DIX, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, Glasgow (3rd impression) 1947.

early Church, whereby the Eucharist is shown to be "the act of the whole Body of Christ through its many members, each with its own 'office'".[56] To bring out that the bishop remained "the high priest and the liturgical minister of his whole Church", portions of the bread consecrated at the bishop's Eucharist were distributed to the eucharists of presbyters elsewhere in the city.[57] There emerges a picture of the pre-Nicene Church as consisting of local Churches such as Rome, Alexandria and Antioch enjoying spontaneous community in faith through the celebration of the liturgy.[58] No doubt, these texts helped crystallize in Afanas'ev's mind an appreciation of the crucial role played by the Eucharist in the giving birth and breeding of a community, especially since during the war years he spent in Tunis he did not have much besides liturgical books for the nourishment of his community.[59]

Schmemann went on to articulate the reality of faith bred on the Eucharist. For one thing, he saw the contemporary Church caught in what he termed a "eucharistic crisis",[60] which expresses itself in a lack of cohesion between what is accomplished in the liturgy and how it is perceived. On the contrary, we can already gather from the words of St Paul (1 Cor 11:17-34) that there is a correlation between the assembly, the Eucharist and the Church.[61] To counteract the aprioris of school theology, which proceeds from its own abstract categories of what Church is to arrive at a reflection on Church, we have to try to retrieve the original sense of the Eucharist as sacrament of the assembly, and, consequently, of the Church.[62] This early ("pre-

---

[56] Ibid., p.35.

[57] Ibid., p. 105.

[58] Ibid., pp. 156, 208.

[59] On Afanas'ev's stay in Tunis as a parish priest see O. ROUSSEAU, "Préface," N. Afanassieff, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, Paris 1975, pp.18-19.

[60] A. SCHMEMANN, *The Eucharist*, Crestwood, N. York 1987, p. 9.

[61] Ibid., p. 11.

[62] Ibid., pp. 12-13.

Nicene") ideal was incorporated in the inseparabality of *lex orandi* and *lex credendi*, given eloquent expression by St Irenaeus: "our teaching is in harmony with the eucharist, and the eucharist confirms our teaching".[63]

When pushed to its logical consequence, the harmony that should obtain between Eucharist and doctrine led Schmemann to reflect on the need of primacy within the one Church Christ had in mind. Somewhat like Afanas'ev, though less strongly than he, Schmemann considers the development in the early Church to one bishop who presides over several eucharistic communities problematic.[64] Unlike Afanas'ev, however, Schmemann has no problem with the term "primacy", which he recognizes as existing on the level of a region such as a metropolitan district, on that of an autocephalous Church, such as a patriarchate or archiepiscopate, as well as that of the whole Church, the universal primacy contended between Rome and Constantinople.[65] The need for primacy Schmemann asserts in spite of the fact that he unabashedly, if circumspectly, defines it

---

[63] *Against Heresies* 4:18:5; *The Eucharist*, p. 13. For Schmenann, the liturgy is not a *locus theologicus*, or theological authority, among others, but condition of the very possibility of theology; A. SCHMEMANN, "Theology and liturgical tradition," in M. Shepherd (ed.), *Worship in Scripture and Tradition*, Oxford 1963, p. 175. Elsewhere, in his *Liturgy and Life: Christian Development through Liturgical Experience*, New York 1974, p. 23, Schmemann offers this comment on "building the Church": "The Church as life and grace is realized through her worship. The Greek word for worship -- *leiturgia* -- means more than common prayer; it means corporate action, in which every one takes an active part, is a participant and not only an 'attendant.' The nature of this action is both *corporate* and *personal*. It is *corporate* because through the unity and faith of its particpants it realizes and fulfills the reality of Church, i.e. the presence of Christ among those who believe in Him. It is *personal* because this reality is every time conveyed to *me*, given *me* for *my* personal edification, for my own growth in grace. Thus in worship I am both an active 'builder' of the Church -- and to be this is my Christian duty -- and I am also its "beneficiary" -- for the whole of the Church's treasure is offered to me, is a Divine gift to me."

[64] "The Idea of Primacy in Orthodox Ecclesiology," p. 154.

[65] "The Idea of Primacy," p. 145.

as a form of power.[66] Given the organic unity of the Church, the need of a universal primacy becomes equally inevitable and is unanimously attested to by Orthodox tradition.[67] While considering Afanas'ev's distinction between eucharistic and universal ecclesiology "of capital importance,"[68] Schmemann takes exception to his rejection of the universal type. According to Schmemann, "the need for, and the reality of a universal head, i.e. the bishop of Rome, can no longer be termed an exaggeration".[69] While Orthodox ecclesiology does not reject the very notion of *primacy* as envisaged by universal ecclesiology, it rejects the mistaken idea that primacy is power over the Church, rather than a ministry within it.[70] While it must be argued that primacy is power, this form of power differs from that of the bishop within his diocese.[71] This power is not that of a "universal bishop," a concept which amounts to the sinful "naturalization" of the Church in the world.[72]

On two other concrete points Schmemann goes beyond Afanas'ev: (a) the positive evaluation of the synod and even the ecumenical council;[73] and (b) the consecration of a bishop as a bond of unity between the particular Churches.[74]

---

[66] Ibid., p. 147.

[67] Ibid., p. 149.

[68] Ibid., p. 150.

[69] Ibid., p. 151.

[70] Ibid., p. 154.

[71] Ibid, p. 165.

[72] Ibid., p. 166. Here "naturalization" is used in the sense of adaptation by abandoning one's religious principles.

[73] "The Idea of primacy in Orthodox Ecclesiology," pp. 159, 160.

[74] Ibid., p. 157. One need only remember what interruption in Church tradition Afanas'ev had envisaged in episcopal ordination to see the difference: "Si le ministère pontifical du premier presbytre devenu évêque, tout au début, ne modifia pas la vie ecclésiale, il fut néanmoins à la racine de modifications profondes dans la conscience dogmatique et, par suite dans la vie même de l'Eglise;" N. AFANAS'EV, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, p. 324.

Unfortunately, this magnificent idea of the harmony of the assembly was lost sight of during the middle ages. The root of the malaise Schmemann sees in the Western scholastic theology's estrangement of sacrament from nature, as if grace were something completely superimposed,[75] an alienation which in turn found complete expression in the rejection of symbolism.[76] Unfortunately, during the confessional scramble for power in the East and the increasing adoption of Western ways of thinking in the wake of the Reformation, it was this dichotomy in theology which prevailed. How this alienation of symbol and symbolized is, on the contrary, healed in the Orthodox grasp of sacraments finds eloquent expression in Schmemann's *For the Life of the World: Sacraments and Orthodoxy*.[77]

2.2. J. Meyendorff (1926-1992)

As with Afanas'ev and Schmemann, O. Cullmann's research forms the background of some of Meyendorff's arguments.[78] Referring specifically to Cullmann's *Early Christian Worship*[79], Meyendorff points out that the sacramental aspect in the life of the early Church has been receiving more positive attention and indicates baptism and the Eucharist as essential elements of this earliest synthesis.[80] Both of them are acts of a

---

[75] Ibid., pp. 29-30.

[76] Ibid., p. 33.

[77] CRESTWOOD, New York 1973, pp. 135-151.

[78] For the influence of O. Cullmann on Afanas'ev, especially the former's *Saint Pierre, disciple-apôtre-martyr* , see "The Church Which Presides In Love," pp. 106, 123. Both Afanas'ev and Cullmann had been observers at Vatican II, the former only in the last session, whereas Cullmann throughout the whole Council (1962-1965); see the latter's reply to John Paul II on the occasion of the conferral of the "Premio internazionale Paolo VI," "L'udienza del Papa a Oscar Cullmann: le parole del premiato," *Istituto Paolo VI*, notiziario n. 25, p. 35, and A. MAFFEIS, "Gli osservatori al Vaticano II," ibid., pp. 39-45.

[79] London 1953.

[80] J. MEYENDORFF, *The Orthodox Church*, Crestwood, N. York 1981, p. 11.

corporate nature, but the life of the community was centered around the Eucharist, the function of president being assumed, at least in Jerusalem, by Peter.[81] But this presidency was soon given various interpretations. St Ignatius of Antioch described every local Church as being the whole Church, with the Lord himself and all the apostles as its head.[82] According to St Cyprian of Carthage, on the contrary, it is Peter's faith that unites all the Churches, and, in this sense, all the bishops may be said to sit on Peter's *cathedra* when they proclaim the one true faith.[83] This identity in faith, Meyendorff continues, was celebrated in the Sunday eucharistic gatherings, which also provided the occasion for the administration of baptism and bishops' discussions.[84] In brief, the Eucharist is the moment when the Church identifies itself with the Kingdom of God.[85] For the Christian who wants to assimilate Christ ("deification") this is possible through the Eucharist and baptism.[86]

For Meyendorff, eucharistic ecclesiology is the ecclesiology of the Orthodox Church. In his *Byzantine Theology* he says:

> Any local church where the "divine liturgy" of the Eucharist is celebrated possesses the "marks" of the true Church of God: unity, holiness, catholicity and apostolicity.[87]

The mystery of the Church is thus fully realized in the Eucharist, thanks to the eschatological character of the

---

[81] Ibid., p. 14.

[82] Ibid., p. 15.

[83] Ibid., pp. 15-16.

[84] Ibid., p. 16.

[85] Ibid., p. 70.

[86] Ibid., p. 206. Meyendorff points out that no Orthodox council has defined the doctrine of the "seven" sacraments. Though the sevenfold approach is convenient in catechism it proves misleading if the impression arises that the unction of the sick is on a par with the Eucharist or baptism (note Meyendorff's order in naming these two sacraments); ibid., p. 73.

[87] J. MEYENDORFF, *Byzantine Theology*, N. York 1974, p. 209.

eucharistic mystery. Here, the Church is most fully itself, its members, sinful taken singly, become fully the Church of God. This is borne out by the liturgical discipline and Byzantine canon law, whose aim is to protect the catholic aspect of the Eucharist, seeing to it that all gather in the same place, at the same time, around the same altar, around the same bishop. The fact that only one Eucharist is allowed each day on a given altar and that a bishop or priest can celebrate the Eucharist only once a day helps bring out that there is only one Christ and only one Church and only one Eucharist.[88]

2.3. John Zizioulas (1931-...)

Zizioulas takes pains to distinguish his approach from Afanas'ev's, as is often the case with thinkers who are very close and yet quite different.[89] For one thing, Zizioulas re-defined the terms of comparison, between a universal and a eucharistic ecclesiology. Unlike Afanas'ev, he reached the conclusion that St Cyprian, too, was a promoter of eucharistic ecclesiology.[90] Zizioulas also criticizes Meyendorff for granting priority to the bishop in his local Church, because in this way the dichotomy between the universal and the particular is perpetuated, "a dilemma transcended by the very nature of the Eucharist".[91]

According to the Greek theologian, among the factors which helped the Orthodox rediscover their own founts of inspiration was the Catholic return to the sources, biblical and patristic, in the first part of the century; here Zizioulas expressly

---

[88] Ibid.

[89] See J. MEYENDORFF, "Foreword," J. Zizioulas *Being as Communion*, p. 12.

[90] Zizioulas writes: "... (I)t must be noted that for St Cyprian *each* episcopal throne is a *cathedra Petri*. This is significant because it implies that the Ignatian view of the indivisibility of the apostolic college in its eschatologicl nature, as it is manifested in the eucharist, is preserved fully for each episcopal Church. It is, therefore, wrong to read universalistic ideas into the ecclesiology of Cyprian;" *Being as Communion*, pp. 200-201.

[91] Ibid., p. 202.

mentions H. de Lubac.[92] Perhaps we may say that the parallel lines meet a second time, after they have already met in Vatican II, in Zizioulas, who has been described as "one of the most profound theologians of our times".[93] The answer to the question of the unity of the various local Churches he saw in the identity of faith and witness these local Churches share together.[94]

Zizioulas has acknowledged de Lubac's influence.[95] Like de Lubac, he tried to avoid the Scylla of scholastic unilateralism, which weakens the inner link between symbolized and symbol, as well as the Charybdis of eucharistic unilateralism, which practically identifies the parish with the "catholic" Church.[96] This he wanted to accomplish by retrieving the neo-patristic synthesis, promoted by his former mentor G. Florovsky, for whom theology, if based on the insightfulness of the Fathers, rather than parroting them, is not the exclusive property of either East or West, but rather promotes a vision congenial to both.[97]

Still, Zizioulas did feel that, in the subsequent elaboration of the patristic heritage, the ways of East and West parted over the role of the person; while its primacy remained in the East, in the West person was subordinated to essence.[98] Applied to human beings, this often meant that the West contented itself with the individual, while ignoring the latter's insertion in communion, more congenial to the East. But even in the East the original

---

[92] MCPARTLAN xv.

[93] Y. CONGAR, "Bulletin d'ecclésiologie," *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 66 (1988) 88.

[94] This answer is spread over the whole of Zizioulas' theology, for, as Y. Spiteris says, the whole theology of Zizioulas is deep down ecclesiological; Y. SPITERIS, *La teologia ortodossa neo-greca*, Bologna 1992, p. 389.

[95] For the references see MCPARTLAN xv. However, in *Being as Communion* itself de Lubac is barely mentioned; see ibid., p. 202.

[96] *E Enotes tes Ekklesias*, pp. 24-25; *Being as Communion*, p. 24.

[97] Ibid., p. 12.

[98] J. ZIZIOULAS, "The Teaching of the 2nd Ecumenical Council on the Holy Spirit in Historical and Ecumenical Perspective," *Credo in Spiritum Sanctum*, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Roma 1983, pp. 46-49.

vision of the Fathers has to be recuperated. For this he has recourse to Greek philosophy as it was received by the Fathers, with its "first leavening" in St Athanasius[99] and a second in the Cappadocian Fathers, especially St Basil[100]. The highpoint of this synthesis was reached with St Maximus the Confessor.[101]

The scenario is thus laid to deal with the problem of the relationship between universal (Church) and the particular (Churches) already in the form of the one and the many. Cognate to this is the idea of Christ's "corporate personality".[102]

---

[99] *Being as Communion*, pp. 39-40: "That is how the first 'leavening' was accomplished: with the doctrine of creation *ex nihilo* the 'principle' of Greek ontology, the *arche* of the world, was transposed to the sphere of freedom. That which exists was liberated from itself; the being of the world became free from necessity."

[100] "Not only was the being of the world traced back to personal freedom, but *the being of God Himself* was identified with the person;" *Being as Communion*, p. 40. On this point see A. de HALLEUX, "Personnalisme ou essentialisme trinitaire chez les Pères Cappadociens?," *Patrologie et oecuménisme*, Leuven 1990, pp. 219-241 and MCPARTLAN 162; see also 169.

[101] Maximus adopted the two leavenings in his synthesis, but reconciled also the two types of prevalent spirituality in early Christianity typified by the more individual-centered Evagrian emphasis on the purification of the mind and the more community-oriented Macarian integration of the heart. "Existence is eucharistic, and spirituality makes no sense if it is not an expression of this 'cosmic liturgy,' which gives meaning to everything. In his commentary on the Eucharist called *Mystagogia*, he sees the human being as the image of the whole church ...;" J. ZIZIOULAS, "The Early Christian Community," B. McGinn, J. Meyendorff and J. Leclercq (ed.s), *Christian Spirituality I: Origins to the Twelfth Century*, New York 1985, pp. 42-43.

[102] J. ZIZIOULAS, "The Mystery of the Church in Orthodox Tradition," *One in Christ* 24 (1988) 299: "In order to speak of the identity of Christ one has to make use of the idea of 'corporate personality'. ... The Semitic mind did not have the difficulty we experience in thinking, for example, Abraham as one in whom his 'seed', i.e. all generations after him, is included, forming his own personal identity. ... Why should we tend to avoid this way of thinking when we come to Christ, the corporate being par excellence? The mystery of the Church consists above all in the mystery of the 'one' who is 'many' -- not of the 'one' who is first one and then, in the *eschata*, becomes 'many', but of the

Just as the redeemed individual has to move from a merely biological hypostasis to ecclesial hypostasis, i.e. from being thrown upon himself or herself to being integrated in Christ's body in time, the Church, so too the individual Church.[103]

In view of this Zizioulas develops the idea that the Church has to be incorporated in this corporate personality, which, in terms of the here and now, translates as the eschatological dimension of the Church. Yet this eschatology must be understood as the first, and not as the last, chapter of ecclesiology.

> (T)he Church cannot be conceived as a permanent institution. She is what it is by becoming again and again what she will be. The Church is an event, taking place again and again, not a society structurally instituted in a permanent way. This does not mean that she has no institutional aspects to her existence. It means that not all such aspects pertain to her true identity which is eschatological.[104]

It is this eschatological dimension which characterizes more than anything else the eucharistic liturgy. Thus, the Church's anamnesis requires the *memory of the future*.[105] Zizioulas condemns any attempt at salvaging time by overlooking the fact that it is the future that saves it. This attempt he decries as *historicism*.[106] At the same time, this forward-looking celebration is tied to its origins, to the Christ-event, so that any attempt to oppose the christological and the pneumatological dimensions of ecclesiology, and of its best expression, the liturgical assembly, are doomed to fail from the start. Since man is unable to force the kingdom, it is the

---

'one', i.e. unique, and 'other' precisely because he relates with the 'many'."

[103] See, on this point, Y. SPITERIS, *La teologia ortodossa neo-greca*, Bologna 1992, pp. 382-389.

[104] Ibid., p. 301.

[105] J. ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, pp. 179-181.

[106] Ibid., pp. 184-186; for a discussion see MCPARTLAN 191.

kingdom which must break into history.[107] At the same time the status of the local Church becomes more evident once we grasp that eucharistic communion is one of both saints and of sacred things.[108]

What Zizioulas has to say on the primacy is a measure of the progress reached in dialogue. Discussing the question of the lack of central authority in the system of 'autocephaly' he notes a certain shift in emphasis in our time, which does not amount to any radical departure from tradition, but rather the application of its fundamental principles. From a christologico-pneumatological point of view the many always need the one in order to express themselves.[109] Any dichotomy between the one and the many is transcneded in the liturgy, because at this moment every assembly is identified with Christ. The eucharistic community is, eschatologically speaking, exactly the same as the entire Church of Christ. Afanas'ev's mistake was different: he identified the Church with the parish.[110] He does not exclude that a single bishop could have, within his Church but for the whole Church, a special ministry of service.

> Reception cannot be limited to the local level but has to be universal. A ministry of universal reception is needed which should meet the requirements of communion. Such requirements would involve the following: (a) that this ministry should be episcopal in nature, i.e., it should be exercised by the head of a local church. This would ensure that universal catholicity does not bypass or contradict the catholicity of the

---

[107] J. ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 185: "The *epiclesis* means ecclesiologically that the Church *asks to receive from God what she has already received historically in Christ as if she had not received it at all*, i.e. as if history did not count in itself."

[108] J. ZIZIOULAS, "Quelques aspects bibliques," in J. Zizioulas, J.-M.-R. Tillard and J.J. von Allmen, *L'eucharistie*, Paris 1970, pp. 58-62.

[109] J. ZIZIOULAS, "The Response of an Orthodox Observer,"(in response to the archbishop of Canterbury, R. Runcie's conference), "The Nature of the Unity We Seek," *One in Christ* 24 (1988) 344.

[110] J. ZIZIOULAS, "L'Ortodossia," *Enciclopedia del Novecento* (Treccani) V, Roma 1980, pp. 1-2, 8-9.

local church. (b) That a consensus of the faithful should be obtained in every act of reception and this should pass through the local bishops and not be a matter of individuals. In these circumstances one should not hesitate to seek such a ministry in the bishop of Rome.[111]

As agreed statements went on to show, eucharistic ecclesiology proved to be extremely fruitful in the elaborating of consensus.

3. The Eucharist also Makes the Church: Debates and Issues

The proposal to re-think the Church along the lines of the Eucharist came at a time when the ecclesiastical world found itself in a transition period. But in order to understand why the idea caught up so soon, it cannot be judged only on the basis of the immediate context of the hectic pre-Vatican II talk of *aggiornamento*. Rather, in a long-term view of things, one would see that the whole debate fits the context of the search of "catholicity" which had been going on in both Catholicism and Orthodoxy - one need only remember J.A. Möhler (1796-1838) and A.S. Khomjakov (1804-1860). Moreover, in the further attempt to explicitate catholicity, or, what amounts to the same thing, delimit the universal by concretizing it, there was, on the one hand, a search for the right balance between the pneumatological and the christological dimensions of the Church, and, on the other, a search for the correct balance between the universal Church and the local Churches. The Eucharist makes the Church; but can it unmake the separated Churches and weld them into the one Church Christ wanted?

The proposal of eucharistic ecclesiology as made by the Orthodox proved fertile, in theological debate, in cutting through the confessional lines.

---

[111] J. ZIZIOULAS, "The Theological Problem of 'Receptionm'," *Centro Pro Unione Bulletin* 26 (1984) 6.

3.1. Orthodox Discussion

Thus far, we have been able to follow primarily the discussion among those theologians who basically shared the general approach to interpreting the Church with the Eucharist as key. We were able to see the progress the idea made within a generation. Here we can only refer briefly to three other Orthodox reactions: P. Evdokimov, P. Trembelas and D. Staniloae.

3.1.1. P. Evdokimov (1901-1970)

In his spirited account, *L'Orthodoxie*,[112] Evdokimov presents eucharistic ecclesiology as if it were the standard Orthodox ecclesiology. Initiation, in the early Church, was spelled out by the three sacraments of baptism, confirmation and the Eucharist, the latter, however, being not only one sacrament among others, but their fulfilment, the "sacrament of sacraments" (Ps-Dionysius).[113] According to Evdokimov, precisely eucharistic ecclesiology is capable of resolving the question of power in the Church. For him, the fact that Christ founded the Church on Peter means that every bishop of any diocese is Peter's direct successor, as St Cyprian considered himself to be.[114]

3.1.2. P. Trembelas (1886-1977)

What an advance eucharistic ecclesiology marks over the more traditionalistic type of ecclesiology found in the manuals may be gathered through the harsh criticism of it offered by Panaghiotis Trembelas. The well-known Greek philosopher and founder of the theological brotherhood of *Sotir* considered this ecclesiology to be in no way warranted by tradition, either

---

[112] Neuchâtel Paris 1959.

[113] Ibid., pp. 128-135.

[114] Ibid., p. 134. Cf also E. Lanne's comment in: E. LANNE, "Introduzione all'edizione italiana," P. Evdokimov, *L'Ortodossia*, Bologna 1981, pp. xxxv-xxxvi.

Catholic or Orthodox.[115] Besides, by supposing that there could be eucharistic union without doctrinal union, Afanas'ev would destroy the primordial unity of charity and truth.[116] In spite of the harshness of Trembelas' criticism Zizioulas could appeal to him in criticising Afanas'ev for the onesidedness of his ideas.[117]

3.1.3. D. Staniloae (1903-1992)

One of the most powerful Orthodox syntheses of our times has been propounded by the Romanian theologian Dumitru Staniloae. Besides the standard criticism against eucharistic ecclesiology, namely, that the latter, for all its merits, cannot do justice to the sacrament of baptism,[118] Staniloae gives a detailed discussion of eucharistic ecclesiology. He agrees with Schmemann's criticism of Afanas'ev's self-sufficient model of the local Church and the need for unity in doctrine as well, but disagrees with Schmemann over the need of a real primacy among churches except in a very functional-administrative way. Even if a local Church possesses ecclesial integrity, it can be considered to be fully Church only when integrated into the whole body of Churches - "just as in each member of the body there is the whole life of the body, but only insofar as it is in the body".[119] A more fitting name than eucharistic community would be "sacramental community".

---

[115] "Theoriai aparadektoi peri ten *Unam Sanctam*," in *Ekklesia*, Athens, 41 (1964/7) 167.

[116] For a discussion of Trembelas' criticism see B. SCHULTZE, "Universal or Eucharistic Ecclesiology," *Unitas* 17 (1965/2) 101-104.

[117] J. ZIZIOULAS, *E Enotes tes Ekklesias*, Athens 1917, pp. 17-18.

[118] Cf D. STANILOAE, "La trasparenza della Chiesa rispetto a Cristo sul fondamento del battesimo," in: D. Staniloae, J. Zizioulas and Madre Eufrasia, *Punti di vista ortodossi su: la Chiesa, la preghiera, lo Spirito Santo e il monachesimo*, Reggio Emilia 1984, pp. 27-39. The importance of both - Eucharist and baptism - was especially thematized by Boris Bobrinskoy in his *Communion du Saint-Esprit*, Abbaye de Bellefontaine 1992.

[119] D. STANILOAE, "Biserica universala si sobornicească," p. 191, quoted and translated by R. Roberson in his doctoral thesis,

3.2. Catholic Reactions

3.2.1. B. Schultze, SJ (1902-1990)

Criticism of one sort or another was not lacking from the Catholic field. Yet the reaction of B. Schultze is noteworthy. From his scholastic perspective he could in good conscience accept the distinction endemic to Afanas'ev's theology between eucharistic and universal ecclesiology, even though not quite in the sense Afanas'ev had in mind.[120] Yet the convergence thus reached before the Council is noteworthy. Writing in 1955 Schultze compares the idea of the Church as "*Ursakrament*" ("primordial sacrament"), as expressed by O. Semmelroth, SJ, with Afanas'ev's idea (as Schultze puts it) of the Eucharist as "*Ursakrament*".[121] In spite of reservations Schultze found himself in basic agreement with Afanas'ev about the Eucharist as root and fountain of Church life; all sacraments are ultimately oriented towards the Eucharist.[122] He even goes so far as to say that, in a sense, Eucharist and Church may be identified, as may eucharistic assembly and the Church, but only in an inadequate way, since Christ's sacramental body is not identical with his mystical body.[123]

3.2.2. A. de Halleux, OFM (1929-1994)

All agree in seeing in St Ignatius of Antioch (c. 110) the first to have used the expression "catholic Church" (Sm 8, 2), so central to Afanas'ev's approach,[124] but disagree as to whether to

---

Contemporary Romanian Orthodox Ecclesiology, Pont. Istituto Orientale 1988, p. 184. On this part see ibid., pp. 182-190.

[120] B. SCHULTZE, "Der Primat Petri und seiner Nachfolger nach den Grundsätzen der universellen und der eucharistischen Ekklesiologie," OCP 31 (1965) 291, 294.

[121] "Eucharistie und Kirche in der russischen Theologie," pp. 257-258.

[122] Ibid., p. 299.

[123] Ibid., p. 300.

[124] And to J. MEYENDORFF, *Catholicity and the Church*, Crestwood, N. York 1983, pp. 7-11.

interpret the expression as referring to the universality of the Church, her orthodoxy, her spiritual communion, her intrinsic perfection or the plenitude of her local realization. All of them are led to adopt a specifically Christian interpretation because they assume that the expression ought to be interpreted along the lines of the ecclesiology it is supposed to have inaugurated.[125] In spite of J. Rius-Camps' objections about the authenticity of the phrase which includes the text, A. de Halleux considers the authenticity of the phrase to be reasonably demonstrated.[126] J.B. Lightfoot's interpretation that the bishop is to his local Church what Christ is to the universal begs the principle, because it presupposes "universality" to have been the first sense of "catholic".[127] The interpretation of "orthodoxy" as suggested by others is anachronistic, because only later on did those whom St Ignatius was in a position to admonish insofar as they still belonged to the Church leave it to form sects.[128] To explain catholicity as "spiritual communion" is more typical of protestant interpreters such as F. Kattenbusch.[129]

A eucharistic ecclesiology such as exposed by N. Afanas'ev and J. Zizioulas stresses catholicity as "the fullness of truth in communion".[130] But, according to de Halleux, whereas St Ignatius certainly would have agreed that each local Church expresses the fullness of the Church of God, the *osper* of Sm 8:2 expresses both identity as well as difference, not only identity, as eucharistic ecclesiology would have it.[131] Even less probable is Zizioulas' interpretation that the Church merits to be called catholic inasmuch as its episcopal Eucharist constitutes the body

---

[125] A. de HALLEUX, "'L'Eglise catholique' dans la lettre ignacienne aux Smyrniotes," in: idem, *Patrologie et Oecuménisme*, Leuven 1990, p. 90.

[126] Ibid., pp. 92, 94.

[127] Ibid., pp. 94-95.

[128] Ibid., p. 97.

[129] Ibid., pp. 100-101.

[130] Ibid., p. 102.

[131] Ibid., p.103.

of Christ in its entirety.[132] To insist that *katholikos* has the sense of a concrete universal, as Zizioulas does, taking its meaning to correspond to that of Aristotle's *katholou*: full, integral, generic etc., is lexicographically unreliable.[133] De Halleux' own interpretation is that Sm 8:2 says nothing about St Ignatius' ecclesiology, since *katholikos* is simply an expression for Church taken as a whole, without any specific meaning.[134] In other words, the first use of the expression "catholic Church" has nothing to do with the catholicity of the Church.

3.2.3. Battista Mondin (1926-...)

Mondin, G. Florovsky's student at Harvard and later peritus at Vatican II, approves of the essential link which Afans'ev establishes, ultimately within a eucharistic integration, between office and charism: charism without office is blind, just as office without charism is empty.[135] Mondin agrees, too, that it is through the eucharistic banquet that one becomes member of the body of Christ that is the Church. What is questionable, on the contrary, are Afanas'ev's conclusions that the Eucharist is the result, not the cause of the Church, and that love and law are incompatible.[136]

3.3. Ecumenical Significance

Rarely does it happen that the creator of a new theological vision, and an Orthodox withal, is invited to what the Catholic Church considers an ecumenical council. This happened to Afanaas'ev, who was invited to the fourth - the last - session of Vatican II. The preparatory schema of the Council bears his name. Most of all, his influence is clearly tangible in Lumen Gentium 3, 7 and 11. We cite for this purpose:

---

[132] Ibid.

[133] Ibid., pp. 104-105.

[134] Ibid., pp. 108-109.

[135] B. MONDIN, *Le nuove ecclesiologie*, Roma 1980, p. 247.

[136] Ibid., pp. 247-248.

> (I)n the sacrament of the eucharistic Bread, the unity of believers, who form one body in Christ, is both expressed and brought about.[137]

The same influence was present in the various dialogues between the Churches. Already the first agreed statement between the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Church bears the name "The Mystery of the Church and the Eucharist in the Light of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity".[138] According to the statement:

> If there are many celebrations, there is nevertheless only one mystery celebrated in which all participate. Moreover, when the believer communicates in the Lord's body and blood, he does not receive a part of Christ but the whole Christ. In the same way, the local church which celebrates the eucharist gathered around its bishop is not a section of the body of Christ. The multiplicity of local synaxes does not divide the church, but rather shows sacramentally its unity. Like the community of the apostles gathered around Christ, each eucharistic assembly is truly the holy church of God, the body of Christ, in communion with the first community of the disciples and with all who throughout the world celebrate and have celebrated the memorial of the Lord. It is also in communion with the assembly of the saints in heaven, which each celebration brings to mind.[139]

The same influence is evident in other consensus papers such as the "Moscow Agreed Statement" (1976) and the "Dublin Agreed Statement" (1984).[140]

---

[137] LG 3; in the translation of NICHOLS 173. See also CIC c. 369.

[138] See D. SALACHAS, *Il dialogo teologico ufficiale tra la Chiesa cattolico-romana e la chiesa ortodossa*, Bari 1986, pp. 85-89.

[139] "The Mystery of the Church and of the Eucharist in the Light of the Mystery of the Holy Trinity," Joint Commission for Theological Dialogue between the Roman Catholic Church and the Orthodox Church, Second Plenary Session (Munich, June 30 to July 6, 1982), The Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity *Information Service*, Vatican City, nr. 49, 1982 II/III p. 111.

[140] NICHOLS 176-177.

3.4. The Mystery of Church and Eucharist: Lessons to Draw From a Debate

1. As may be gathered from ecumenical dialogue, a remarkable degree of convergence has been achieved with the hermeneutical key of the Eucharist-Church relationship, and not only on the theme of Church. If judging a theory by its fruits is worth anything, it would certainly show how fruitful eucharistic ecclesiology is. The subsequent debate helps attune an essentially fundamental insight to the various modalities of religious and theological existence.

2. It may easily be overlooked that the kind of universality implied in the dialectic of universal Church and local Churches of eucharistic ecclesiology has something to do with the universality of *sobornost.* If we consider Afanas'ev's masterpiece, *L'Eglise de l'Esprit-Saint,* the same kind of pneumatological orientation of ecclesiology becomes evident. So perhaps it would be better to say that the whole discussion which started with Khomjakov and continued with Afanas'ev had as its one theme *catholicity.* Translated at first as "*sobornost"* by the Khomjakov disciple Y. Samarin (1819-1876), it was used by the young G. Florovsky, who later on, however, settled down for "catholicity". I suggest, however, that the word *sobornost,* usually translated as collegiality or catholicity, had best be translated as "canonicity", so long as a Westerner recovers the depth the word has for an Easterner and does away with any legalistic narrowing of the concept. *Sobornost* somehow expresses at once catholicity, collegiality, conciliarity and canonicity. But the canonicity here at issue means being in tune with the Church from within as by a connatural feeling, as integral part of the Church. Or, to put it in terms with which a Westerner might be familar from Saint Ignatius of Loyola (1491-1556), a state of mind and heart which is reached through the long school of discernment of spirits for

which there exist rules, e.g., for thinking in and with the Church.[141]

3. Canonicity interpreted in this way reflects the union of the pneumatologic and the eucharistic dimensions of ecclesiology. That V. Lossky, in his time, prior to Vatican II, insisted so much on the economy of the Spirit, conceived as independent from that of the Son,[142] may have been a reaction against the contemporary tendency in Catholic theology to see the primacy of the Pope as corresponding to the *Filioque* in the Trinity.[143]

4. The Church celebrates the Eucharist, but it is the Eucharist that makes the Church. As has been pointed out, "the fundamental text in this connection",[144] is number 26 of the dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium*:

---

[141] See IGNACIO de LOYOLA, *Ejercicios Espirituales: Introducción, texto, notas y vocabulario* por Cándido de Dalmases, SJ, Santander 1987, pp. 313-327, 352-370.

[142] See V. LOSSKY, *The Mystical Theology of the Church*, translated by members of the Fellowship of Saint Alban and St Sergius, London 1973, pp. 135-195. "Lossky is correct when he sees the sobornicity of the Church as modelled on the pattern of the Holy Trinity and sustained by the irradiation of the Holy Trinity within her. ... In his explanation of the Church Lossky makes use of one of his own theories according to which Christ brings about the Church only as unity, and the Holy Spirit only as diversity. ... In reality the Holy Spirit is neither a cause of disintegration in the Church nor of mere diversification, and this for two reasons: firstly, because he is communicated within the unity of the Body of Christ, and secondly because he is himself the power of unification, the gift of unity in communion, and hence the factor which constitutes the Mystical Body of the Lord, which is to say, the Church;" D. STANILOAE, *Theology and the Church*, translated by R. Barringer, Crestwood, N. York 1980, pp. 65-66.

[143] See, on this point, Y. CONGAR, *The Mystery of the Church*, translated by G. Chapman, Baltimore 1960, pp. 153-154. Writing in 1953, Congar observes the pneumatic tendency of Orthodox ecclesiology by recurring to St Thomas Aquinas' explanation in *Contra errores Graecorum*, lio. 2, prol., namely that rejection of the *Filioque* is analogous to the rejection of the Pope. Later on, Congar gave up this position.

[144] G. J. BÉKÉS, O.S.B., "The Eucharist Makes the Church: The Ecclesial Dimension of the Sacrament," in R. Latourelle (ed.), *Vatican*

> This Church of Christ is really present in all legitimately organized local groups of the faithful, which, insofar as they are united to their pastors, are also quite appropriately called churches in the New Testament. For all these are in fact, in their own localities, the new people called by God, in the power of the Holy Spirit and as the result of full conviction (cf. 1 Thess. 1:5). In them the faithful are gathered together through the preaching of the Gospel of Christ, and the mystery of the Lord's Supper is celebrated. In these communities, though they may often be small and poor, or existing in the diaspora, Christ is present through whose power and influence the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church is constituted. For "the sharing in the body and blood of Christ has no other effect than to accomplish our transformation into that which we receive".[145]

The presence of Christ in every legitimate local assembly of Christians, called, in the New Testament, Churches; Churches constituted through the preaching of the Word of God and the celebration of the liturgy as approved by the bishop[146]; these local Churches become, through participation in the body of Christ that is the Eucharist the body of Christ that is the Church.

Full catholicity is therefore attained only when one remembers that both Word and Sacrament, the unity of doctrine celebrated in a common liturgy. In good Orthodox and Catholic

---

II. Assessment and Perspectives: Twenty-five Years After (1962-1987), New York 1989, p. 347. In this number 4 of my present article I am greatly indebted to Békés, who does not, however, bring out the importance of baptism.

[145] Ibid., p. 348. Translated by G.J. Békés, O.S.B.

[146] See *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 26, 42. As Békés points out, a priest who celebrates in a community smaller than the local Church always celebrates as a member of the *presbyterium* whose head is the bishop; G.J. BÉKÉS, "The Eucharist Makes the Church," p. 360. It is interesting to note that Afanaas'ev's "own eucharistic practice as a celebrant went counter to his eucharistic ecclesiology of the christian assembly. Held quietly in the presence of his wife and child, and a few of the faithful, in a corner of the chapel of Saint-Serge, his celebrations approximated as closely as was feasible in the Orthodox Church to the Western *missa privata*;" NICHOLS 59.

manier, this unity of doctrine is seen in line with *diadoche* and *paradosis*, apostolic succession and tradition, whereby succession is the form of tradition and tradition is the content of succession.[147] Ratzinger adds:

> Of the three components sacrament-word-office the third is not on the same level as the other two: The first two *ground* the unity, the third *witnesses* to it.[148]

In a word, the eucharistic liturgy is a good and apt rendition of the mystery of the Church, if it is taken not in an exclusive, but in an inclusive sense.

5. What could this inclusive sense of the eucharistic liturgy mean? One would be inclined to answer in various ways. It would include baptism and Eucharist, for example. But I think that even this is misleading. It obfuscates the fact of the unique sacramentality of Christ, fount of the sacraments, as reflected in His Church, the foundational sacrament, or, to use the expression of St John the Evangelist, *symeion*, sign of signs.[149] And precisely in this context, I find it intriguing that St John, in the reconstruction of the new week of creation, or rather, of the re-creation of the world after the incarnation of the Logos, does not cap this brand-new week with a eucharistic sign as clear as John 6 but with a marriage, even if the wine has been interpreted as a sign of the Eucharist, too. Thus, the inclusive sense of the Eucharist would have to contain a positive reference to the other sacraments.

---

147 "So zeigt sich, daß 'apostolische Überlieferung' und 'apostolische Nachfolge' sich gegenseitig definieren. Die Nachfolge ist die Gestalt der Überlieferung, die Überlieferung ist der Gehalt der Nachfolge;" J. RATZINGER, "Primat, Episkopat und *successio apostolica*," K. Rahner and J. Ratzinger, *Episkopat und Primat*, Freiburg i.Br. 1961, p. 49; see G.J. BÉKÉS, OSB, "The Eucharist Makes the Church," p. 258.

148 J. RATZINGER, "Das geistliche Amt und die Einheit der Kirche," quoted by G.J. Békés, OSB, "The Eucharist Makes The Church," p. 363; translated by me.

149 C.H. DODD, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge 1968, pp. 297-300; R. SCHACKENBURG, *Das Johannesevangelium* I, Freiburg i.Br. 1967, pp. 341-356.

6. One of the pressing problems which eucharistic ecclesiology makes acute, and rightly so, is the link between bishop and diocese. On this token it has been argued that, for example, titular bishoprics are simply nonsensical. However, could not lost offices such as that of the apostle, with its *Wandercharisma*[150], be also retrieved? Eucharistic ecclesiology could throw here some light on the phenomenon known to sociology, namely that the traditional neighbourhood, with the advent of cars, does not exist any more. Perhaps, we should look at it the other way round: it is our idea of diocese, still heavily dependent on Diocletian's (245-313) bureaucratic genius, which should become somewhat more flexible. This at a time when diocese could be, in accordance with the dictates of our age, bound less to local territory and more to operative units, who meet and work together more so than neighbours, so that for all practical purposes they are the community.

3.5. Church as Consummation of Communion

The Church, being a mystery, cannot be grasped except in ways that renounce attempts to capture the word and control it. This points to all those means that give expression to beauty, thus eluding the human temptation to subordinate mystery to mind. A hymn expresses what words fail to;[151] and a stone can surpass them both. It is in this way that the Church tried to give expression to its abiding committal to the plenitude of Church life and doctrine in its buildings. At the beginning, the Church had to cope with catechumens entering in droves. This has left its imprint in the expression, "mass of the catechumens", which in turn was embodied in Church architecture, with the emphasis on the baptistery. Later on, when all proclaimed themselves to be Christians, the stress was shifted to the "mass of the faithful" and laid on the altar of the sacrifice.

---

[150] N. LOHFINK, "Die Enkel der Wanderapostel," *Kirchenträume*, Freiburg i.Br. 1982, p. 162.

[151] "Mehr als Worte sagt ein Lied," as the German hymn runs.

The Church is thus an ellipse, it needs both centers, and something of it is lost when one is stressed at the expense of the other. The loss of this ellipse makes itself felt tragically. Granted that the expression "mass of the catechumens" may give rise to the impression that this important part of the liturgy was reserved for candidates for baptism, an impression farther deepened by the second part, "mass of the faithful". Indeed, it would be more correct to call them "liturgy of the word" and "liturgy of the Eucharist."[152] And yet, at what a price the Church had to learn that even after baptism her members somehow remain catechumens, that is to say, have to be introduced, again and again, to the essentials of the faith, and may be described as "neo-catechumens"? Naturally, no position is being taken here about the neocatechumenate movement started by Kiko Arguello (b. 1939), and yet, Kiko Arguello has been able to strike a chord in the human heart because it corresponds to a basic widespread need in the Church over and above his movement.

Conclusion

Eucharistic ecclesiology rightly sizes up the Church from its peak moment. This in itself is a no mean achievement, especially when one remembers what was left behind. Surely such a corrective was sorely needed to inject vitality into the heartless business debate about the Church not infrequently degenerates into. Going through the progress registered by the various representatives of eucharistic ecclesiology we see it stretching out to illuminate the various dimensions of Church reality. In a nutshell: eucharistic ecclesiology can serve to recapitulate the whole of this reality so long as it is not taken as the only model which excludes others. Once this restrictive view prevails the multifarious reality of the Christian and his or her

---

[152] In his remarkable work, *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy*, University Park and London 1971, still uses these distinctions: "Chapter 6: The Liturgy of the Catechumens" (pp.138-154) amd "Chapter 7: The Liturgy of the Faithful" (pp.155-176).

being bound up to the community of the body of Christ becomes impaired.

The reason for the success of the eucharistic adage may well lie in that suddenly the law which regulates the relationship of faith and worship, *lex orandi lex credendi*, has been taken seriously with regards to one sacrament and has re-established contact with the fullness of reality. However, the same could be claimed for baptism, whereby one would then be arguing not from the peak but from the foundational moment, indispensable for all that follows, as St Paul does in his Letter to the Romans, a text which is so universal as to be used, in the Latin rite at least, for both baptisms (Rm 6:3-5) and funerals (Rm 6:3-9). And the same could be said, to a lesser degree of every other sacrament, so long as the inclusive eucharistic vision of the Church is not lost sight of. In this inclusive vision, if the Eucharist does not make the Church nothing else could.

LITURGY MAKES THE CHURCH: Towards a Catholic Sacramental Ecclesiology

Paul Pallath

The liturgical heritage of a Church includes the sacraments, sacramentals, divine praises (liturgy of the hours), liturgical year, etc. But by liturgy we mean primarily the holy Eucharist and other sacraments. Every sacrament has an ecclesiological dimension and each contributes in its own manner to the edification of the Church. But as far as the formation of a Christian community is concerned the sacraments of initiation, namely baptism, anointing with the holy myron (confirmation) and the holy Eucharist are particularly important. It is by these sacraments that a person becomes a full fledged Christian, a perfect abode of the most Holy Trinity and thus a true member of the Church. In this article I limit myself to elucidate the ecclesiological dimension of the sacraments of initiation since they contribute in an eminent manner to the formation of a Church. First of all we establish that the Church is a communion effected and nourished by the sacraments. Then we proceed to the different levels of Church-communions, namely eparchies or dioceses, intermediary communions like the patriarchates and the universal Church.

1. The Church as a Communion Effected and Nourished by Liturgy

1.1. The Eucharistic Origin of the Church

The people of God in the Old Testament is the prototype of the new and thus there exists an intimate relationship between the two. Therefore, first of all we look for the formative elements of the old people of God in order to elucidate those of the new one, namely the Church. The old people of God was constituted by the first paschal celebration and the subsequent

liberation of Israel from Egypt. The Lord himself commanded them to celebrate the Passover as a feast to the Lord: "This day shall be for you a memorial day, and you shall keep it as a feast to the Lord: throughout your generations you shall observe it as an ordinance forever" (Ex. 12, 14).

After the liberation from Egypt Israel came to Mount Sinai under the leadership of Moses to encounter and worship God. This was followed by the covenant by which the Israelites were constituted as the people of God, a kingdom of priests and a holy nation. According to the command of the Lord, Moses brought the people to meet him: and they stood at the foot of the mountain. Mount Sinai was wrapped in smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire and the whole mountain quaked. Thus was the great theophany of God on Mount Sinai. God spoke to the people through Moses and Aaron and entered into a covenant with them giving the ten commandments and other rules of worship and moral conduct.[1]

This covenant was concluded by offerings, sacrifices and worship on the part of the people. The covenant was ratified by the pouring of the blood on the people. "And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord. And he rose early in the morning, and built an altar at the foot of the mountain, and twelve pillars according to the twelve tribes of Israel. And he sent young men of the people of Israel, who offered burnt offerings and sacrificed peace offerings of oxen to the Lord. And Moses took half of the blood and put it in basins, and half of the blood he threw against the altar. Then he took the book of the covenant, and read it to the people; and they said, 'All that the Lord has spoken we will do, and we will be obedient'. And Moses took the blood and threw it upon the people, and said, "Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord has made with you in accordance with all these words".[2] In short, the Passover and the rite of the

[1] Cf. Exodus 19, 16-24.

[2] Cf. Exodus, chapters 20-23.

Sinai covenant are the two constitutive acts through which Israel became the people of God.[3]

According to the command of the Lord himself Israel remembers all these salvific events every year during the celebration of the Passover. "The theme of the celebration is, of course, the liberation of the people of Israel from slavery, and the creation of a liberated people, specifically through the covenant, as the holy and priestly people of God".[4] The liturgical rite of this celebration consists of the sacrifice of the lamb and a sacred meal. By sharing the same meal the Israelites entered into communion among themselves and with God who accomplished the great salvific events and who become present in the community.[5] Thus the Passover celebration and the sacred meal were means that always helped Israel to remain as a community. About it Békés writes, "...the Old Testament meal is a sacrificial meal of an anamnetic and eschatological nature, which has the power actually to create the community of the holy and priestly people of God, because as memorial it 'recalls' the Lord and his salvific action of the past, and, in virtue of the 'memory' of the Lord, the divine salvation worked in the past is performed in it in the present, while the fulfillment of eschatological salvation is foretold in it as a prophetic sign. The Passover meal is thus the liturgical and sacramental rite in which communion between God and Israel, and among the Israelites themselves, is brought about: in it, Israel is truly created as the holy and priestly people in covenant with God".[6]

From what we have seen, the formative elements of the old people of God are the following:

---

[3] J. RATZINGER, *La Chiesa una comunità sempre in cammino*, Edizioni Paoline, Milano 1991, 19.

[4] GERARDO J. BÉKÉS, "The Eucharist Makes the Church, the Ecclesial Dimension of the Sacrament" in R. Latourelle, ed. *Vatican II Assessment and Perspectives, Twenty-five Years After (1962-1987)*, New York/Mahwah 1989, 350.

[5] FÜGLISTER, *Il valore salvifico della pasqua*, Brescia 1976, 143-144.

[6] GERARDO J. BÉKÉS, "The Eucharist Makes the Church...", 352; cf. J. RATZINGER, *Il nuovo popolo di Dio*, Brescia 1992, 86-87.

1. The first Passover celebration and the liberation of the Israelites from slavery in Egypt under the leadership of Moses.

2. The great theophany of God on Mount Sinai with signs and wonders through which the Israelites experienced their redeemer and entered into communion with him.

3. The covenant between God and Israel, the offering of sacrifices and worship on the part of the people and the ratification of the covenant by the pouring of the blood.

4. The commemoration of all these salvific events every year during the Passover celebration through which communion with God and among the Israelites is fostered and thus Israel remains as a community.

It is greatly remarkable that Jesus celebrated the first Eucharist with his disciples during the Old Testament Passover meal, substituting himself for the sacrificed lamb. With the celebration of the Eucharist together with the twelve apostles Jesus inaugurated the new covenant and thus originated the new people of God, the Church. The covenantal aspect of the Eucharist is clear from the words of Jesus himself. "Now as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and broke it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, 'take, eat; this is my body'. And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he gave it to them, saying, 'drink of it all of you; for this is my blood of the *covenant,* which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins'".[7]

Just as the old covenant was ratified by the pouring of blood, Jesus ratified the new covenant on the cross by breaking his own body and pouring his own blood and thus offering himself to the Father. In the words of Pope Paul VI "just as Moses with the blood of calves had sanctified the Old Testament, so also Christ Our Lord, through the institution of the Mystery of the Eucharist, with his own blood sanctified the New Testament,

---

[7] Mt. 26, 26-30; Cf. Mk. 14, 22-26; Lk. 22, 14-20; 1 Cor. 11, 23-25.

whose mediator He is".[8] The salvific death of Christ on the cross is anticipated in the Last Supper in a sacramental manner. There is an intimate relationship between the action of Christ during the Last Supper and his salvific death on the cross. There would have been no meaning for the action of Christ during the Last Supper unless it would have been ratified by his own death on the cross. Thus the new people of God, namely the Church originated from the new covenant which Jesus established by the first celebration of the Eucharist during the Last Supper and ratified by the pouring of his own blood and by his own salvific death on the cross.

In his Apostolic letter *Dominicae Cenae*, Pope John Paul II clearly affirms the eucharistic origin of the Church:

> The Church was founded, as the new community of the People of God, in the apostolic community of those twelve who, at the Last Supper, became partakers of the body and blood of the Lord under the species of bread and wine. Christ had said to them: 'Take and eat .... Take and drink'. And carrying out this command of His, they entered for the first time into sacramental communion with the Son of God, a communion that is a pledge of eternal life. From that moment until the end of time, the Church is being built up through that same communion with the Son of God, a communion which is a pledge of the eternal Passover ... This drawing together and this union, the prototype of which is the union of the Apostles about Christ at the Last Supper, express the Church and bring her into being.[9]

The words of Cardinal Ratzinger echo those of the pope: "The Church has become such, when the Lord, after having given his body and his blood under the species of bread and wine, said 'Do this in memory of me'. This signifies: the Church is a response to this task, to the authority and the responsibility which it involves. The Church is Eucharist. This implies that she originates from

---

[8] Pope PAUL VI, *Mysterium Fidei,* encyclical letter of 3 September 1965, AAS 57 (1965) 759.

[9] Pope JOHN PAUL II, *Dominicae Cenae*, February 1980, no. 4, AAS 72 (1980) 119-120.

death and resurrection, otherwise the phrase about the donation of body would have remained an empty word, if it had not been an anticipation of the real sacrifice on the cross; so as the memory of the sacramental celebration would have been a cult of the dead, would be part of our mourning for the omnipotence of death, if the resurrection would not have transformed this body into 'life-giving Spirit'" (1 Cor. 15, 45)".[10] He writes again that:

> The establishment of the most holy Eucharist in the evening that precedes the passion of Christ cannot be viewed as any other more or less isolated action. It is the stipulation of a pact, and as such, the concrete foundation of the new people who becomes such through its relationship of covenant with God. We could also say: in virtue of the eucharistic event, Jesus involves the disciples in his relationship with God and on that account also in his mission which has the aim on 'many', namely the humanity of all the places and all times. These disciples become 'people' through the communion with the body and blood of Jesus, which is at the same time communion with God. The Old Testament idea of covenant, which Jesus accepted in his preaching, receives a new centre: the communion with the body of Christ. We could say: the people of the new covenant becomes people only from the body and blood of Christ. It can be called 'people of God', because, through the communion with Christ, the relationship with God is opened, which man is unable to establish by himself".[11]

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* also clearly affirms that the Church originated from the sacrifice of Christ on the cross, anticipated in the Eucharist. "The Church is born primarily of Christ's total self-giving for our salvation, anticipated in the institution of the Eucharist and fulfilled on the cross. 'The origin and growth of the Church are symbolized by the blood and water which flowed from the open side of the

---

[10] J. RATZINGER, *La Chiesa una comunità sempre in cammino*, 55.

[11] Ibidem, 19-20; Cf. also J. RATZINGER, *Church, Ecumenism and Politics*, New York 1988, 8.

crucified Jesus'. 'For it was from the side of Christ as he slept the sleep of death upon the cross there came forth the 'wondrous sacrament of the Church".[12]

The Church which is born from the perfect sacrifice of Christ on the cross is continually built up by the Eucharist because the same sacrifice of Christ, the same saving mystery, is present in every eucharistic celebration. "The sacrifice of Christ and the sacrifice of the Eucharist are *one single sacrifice:* the victim is one and the same: the same now offers through the ministry of priests, who then offered himself on the cross; only the manner of offering is different. In this divine sacrifice which is celebrated in the Mass, the same Christ who offered himself once in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross is contained and is offered in an unbloody manner".[13] "Christian liturgy not only recalls the events that saved us but actualizes them, makes them present. The Paschal mystery of Christ is celebrated, not repeated. It is the celebrations that are repeated, and in each celebration there is an out pouring of the Holy Spirit that makes the unique mystery present".[14] Thus through the eucharistic celebration the same sacrifice of Christ on the cross is made present and the Church is ever newly created.

1.2. The Methodology of the Formation of a Church according to the Acts of the Apostles

The Acts of the Apostles is considered to be the first ecclesiological treatise and the first Church-community as the model of all other Christian communities. Therefore, we try to elucidate in a nutshell how the first Churches originated. After the resurrection and ascension of Jesus, the apostles gathered in the "upper room" where Jesus celebrated the first Eucharist. They "with one accord devoted themselves to prayer, together with the women and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his

---

[12] *Catechism of the Catholic Church,* English edition Geofrey Chapman, 1994, no.766; this affirmation is based on LG 3 & SC 5.

[13] *Catechism of the Catholic Church,* no.1367.

[14] Ibidem, no.1104.

brothers" (Acts 1, 14). It is on this worshipping community that the Holy Spirit descended from heaven (Acts 2, 1-3). After the reception of the Holy Spirit, Peter preached the word of God on behalf of the apostles. The content of his preaching, as also in the other discourses of Acts, was the salvific acts of God, culminated in the Christ event, namely the mysteries of incarnation, public ministry, passion, death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus, and the consequent coming of the Holy Spirit.[15] The preaching of the word is the first step towards the formation of a Christian community.

There were Jews and devout men from every nation under heaven (Acts 2, 5) who came together to hear the discourse of Peter. Those who heard the word of God were cut to the heart and said to Peter and the rest of the apostles "Brethren what shall we do" ? (Acts 2, 37). The preaching of the word evokes faith and conversion. The people gathered were ready to receive the word, the salvific acts accomplished in Jesus Christ and to do everything possible according to the mind of the apostles to receive the salvation.

Those who have faith can become the disciples of Christ by the reception of the sacraments of initiation, namely, baptism, confirmation (reception of Holy Spirit) and the Eucharist. Peter said to those who repented "be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit" (Acts 2, 38). About three thousand people received baptism on the same day and thus the first Christian community was formed. Baptism and the reception of the Holy Spirit are only the beginning of Christian life. The baptized continue in the hearing of the word and in prayer, with the Christian initiation becoming perfect only by the reception of Eucharist. Therefore, those who received baptism "devoted themselves to the apostle's preaching and fellowship, to the breaking of the bread and the prayers" (Acts 2, 42).

---

[15] Cfr. Acts 2, 14-36; 3, 11-26; 4, 8-12; 7, 1-53; 8, 4 -13; 10, 34-43; 13, 13-41; 17, 22-31; 22, 1-21, etc.

The methodology of the formation of a Christian community or Church is the same also in other passages of Acts: the predication of the word, the generation of faith and the reception of the sacraments of initiation, or in other words the liturgy of the word and the liturgy of the sacraments. Philip preached the Good News about Jesus in Samaria and many people repented and received the sacrament of baptism (Acts 8, 1-13). When the Apostles at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent Peter and John. They came to Samaria and prayed for them that they might receive the Holy Spirit. Then they laid their hands on them and they received the Holy Spirit (Sacrament of Confirmation). Thus a local Church was formed in Samaria (Acts 8,14-17). According to the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, Philip preached to the Ethiopian eunuch who also repented and received the sacrament of baptism and became a member of the Church (Acts 8, 26-40).

Peter preached the salvific events accomplished by Jesus Christ to the gentile Cornelius and a multitude of persons gathered in his house. While Peter was preaching, the Holy Spirit descended on all who heard the word, and all of them were baptized in the name of Jesus Christ and thus these gentiles also became members of the Church (Acts 10, 34-48).

Similarly due to the missionary activity of St Paul, many gentiles accepted the word of God, received the sacrament of baptism and the Holy Spirit, and thus different local Churches originated. In Antioch many gentiles believed and the word of the Lord spread throughout all the region (Acts 11, 19-24; 13, 13-52 & 14, 21). In Iconium a great number of people, both Jews and gentiles believed (Acts 14, 1). In Corinth, "Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, believed in the Lord, together with all his household; and many of the Corinthians hearing Paul believed and were baptized" (Acts 18, 8). Similarly in Ephesus many "were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them; and they spoke with tongues and prophesied" (Acts 19, 5-6).

According to the witness of the Acts, the primitive Church was a communion in the vertical and horizontal levels,

namely communion with God and communion among the faithful. This communion was effected by the liturgy of the word and the liturgy of the sacraments. According to the testimony of the Acts, all those who were baptized "devoted themselves to the apostle's preaching and fellowship, to the breaking of bread and the prayers" (Acts 2, 42). The first Christian community was a worshipping community that grew day by day in communion with God:

> And day by day, attending the temple together and breaking bread in their homes, they partook of food with glad and generous hearts, praising God and having favour with all the people (Acts 2, 46-47).

In the middle of difficulties and problems the faithful gained strength and courage through their communion with God by means of prayer. For example, after the release of Peter and John from custody, they went to their friends and all of them together lifted their voices and prayed to God. When they had prayed, the place in which they were gathered together was shaken; and they were filled with the Holy Spirit and spoke the word of God with boldness (Acts 4, 23-31).

The communion of the faithful with the triune God resulted in the communion and real fellowship of all the believers even in the material things. "And all who believed were together and had all things in common; and they sold their possessions and goods and distributed them to all, as any had need" (Acts 2, 43-44). We see another account of the communion among Christian faithful in Acts chapter 4, 32-37:

> Now the company of those who believed were of one heart and soul, and no one said that any of the things which he possessed was his own, but they had every thing in common....there was not a needy person among them, for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the proceeds of what was sold and laid it at the apostles' feet; and distribution was made to each as they had need.

From what we have seen so far, the methodology of the formation of a Christian community or Church is as follows:

1. Preaching of the word of God: the proclamation of the mysteries of salvation culminated in the Paschal Mystery: the passion, death, resurrection and the ascension of Jesus Christ and the consequent descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. Preaching of the word generates faith and repentance.

2. Reception of the sacraments of Initiation: those who believed in Jesus Christ were baptized in the name of the triune God, Father, Son and the Holy Spirit. All of them also received the Holy Spirit (later called confirmation), either by the laying on of hands by an apostle or in some other manner. Those who received baptism and the Holy Spirit participated assiduously in the eucharistic celebration and devoted themselves also to the apostolic preaching and constant prayer.

3. The reception of the same sacraments by the faithful, namely the same one baptism, and the same one Holy Spirit, and the participation in the same body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, made up the body of Christ, the Church.

4. Thus the primitive Church was a communion effected by the word and sacraments, in the vertical and horizontal levels. The sacraments of initiation produce an ontological communion with God and among the faithful, because through the sacraments all the faithful participate in the same life and being of God.

1.3. The Methodology of the Formation of a Church according to the Recent Magisterium of the Church

From the beginning till today the Catholic Church knows no other method for the formation of a new Church or Christian community other than the celebration of the liturgy of the word and the liturgy of sacraments. What the Church is doing today (and in the future) for the formation of a Church in the mission countries is the preaching of the word and the celebration of the sacraments of initiation. The methodology and procedure is the same all over the world. First of all the word of God should be proclaimed. Those who believe in Jesus Christ become definitively members of the Church through the liturgy of

baptism. Their membership in the Church becomes perfect by the reception of the Holy Spirit and the celebration of the Eucharist and the reception of Christ himself in the holy communion. Thus "the sacraments make the Church, since they manifest and communicate to men, above all in the Eucharist, the mystery of communion with God who is love, one in three persons".[16]

The *Sacrosanctum Concilium* clearly teaches that the preaching of the word and the celebration of the sacraments make the Church, and this is the principle operative in the Church from the day of Pentecost for the formation of a Church. "Just as Christ was sent by the Father, he himself sent apostles, filled with the Holy Spirit, and for the same purpose: that they should preach the good news to every creature, and thus announce that the Son of God, by his death and resurrection, had freed us from the power of Satan and death, and carried us over to the Father's kingdom. Not only this, however: they were also to enact what they were announcing through sacrifice and sacraments, the things around which the whole liturgical life revolves. *This is how it is that people are implanted into the paschal mystery of Christ through baptism*: how they die with him, are buried with him and rise with him; how they receive the spirit of adoption as daughters and sons, the spirit 'in whom we cry Abba, Father' (Rom. 8, 15)...In a similar way, each time people eat at the Lord's supper, they are proclaiming the death of the Lord until he comes. *This is the principle operative as, on the very day of Pentecost, when the church appeared in the world, those who received Peter's word 'were baptized'.* And they were 'steadfast in the apostles' teaching and the fellowship of breaking bread and the prayers ...praising God together and winning the good opinions of all the people'" (Acts 2, 41-42, 47).[17] Speaking about the purpose of the sacraments the council

---

[16] *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, no. 1118.

[17] *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, no.6; cf. also *Per initiatioins Christianae*, Instruction of the Congregation for Divine Worship, 24 June 1973, English tr. in A. Flannery ed., *Vatican Council II: More Post Conciliar Documents*, New York 1982, 22-26.

affirms that "the purpose of the sacraments is to sanctify men, to build up the Body of Christ (the Church), and finally, to give worship to God" (SC n. 59).

The divine nature and organic structure of the Church can be effected only by the celebration of the sacraments and not by any amount of human effort as in the case of other societies. Here are the words of *Lumen Gentium* : "The sacred nature and organic structure of the priestly community is brought into operation through the sacraments and the exercise of virtues. Incorporated into the Church by baptism, the faithful are appointed by their baptismal character to Christian religious worship; reborn as sons of God, they must profess before men the faith they have received from God through the Church. By the sacrament of Confirmation they are more perfectly bound to the Church and are endowed with the special strength of the Holy Spirit ....Taking part in the eucharistic sacrifice, the source and summit of the Christian life, they offer the divine victim to God and themselves along with it...then strengthened by the body of Christ in the eucharistic communion, they manifest in a concrete way that unity of the people of God which this holy Sacrament aptly signifies and admirably realizes".[18]

The decree *Ad Gentes* no.6 affirms that the special end of the missionary activity is the evangelization and the implanting of the Church among peoples or groups in which it has not yet taken root, and thus the formation of indigenous particular Churches. "The principal instrument in this work of implanting the Church is the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It was to announce this Gospel that the Lord sent his disciples into the whole world, that men, having been reborn by the word of God (cf. 1 Pet. 1, 23) might through baptism, be joined to the Church which, as the body of the Word Incarnate, lives and is nourished by the word of God and the Eucharist (cf. Acts 4, 23)". The *Evangelii Nuntiandi* promulgated by Pope Paul VI, clearly affirms: "The Church takes its origin from the work of evangelization by Christ and the twelve apostles. Of this

[18] *Lumen Gentium,* no.11.

work she is the natural fruition. She is the end to which this work was directed, its immediate and most striking achievement: 'Go therefore, and make disciples of all nations'. And further: 'Those who received the word were baptized and there were added that day about three thousand souls...and the Lord added to their numbers day by day those who were being saved'.[19] "..the consummation of evangelization, in addition to the preaching of the message, consists in building up of the Church which has no real existence without that spirit which is the sacramental life culminating in the blessed Eucharist".[20]

According to the Oriental Code, "through the sacraments... Jesus Christ sanctifies people by the power of the Holy Spirit so that they become in a unique way true worshipers of God the Father and by which they are inserted into the Church, his body ...".[21] Both codes of canon law also clearly point out that one becomes a member of the Church through the sacrament of baptism. It is through baptism that people are incorporated in Christ, becoming sharers in Christ's priestly, prophetic and royal function in their own manner and have been constituted as the people of God.[22] "One becomes a *member* of this people not by a physical birth, but by being 'born anew, 'a birth of water and the Spirit', that is, by faith in Christ, and Baptism". Therefore "baptism incorporates us *into the Church.* From the baptismal font is born the one People of God of the New Covenant, which transcends all the natural or human limits of nations, cultures, races and sexes: For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body".[23]

---

[19] Pope PAUL VI, *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, apostolic exhortation of 8 December 1975, no. 15, AAS 68 (1976) 13-14.

[20] *Evangelii Nuntiandi*, no. 28, AAS 68 (1976) 24.

[21] CCEO c. 667.

[22] Cf. CIC c. 204, see also cc.111 & 849; the corresponding canons in CCEO, cc. 7, 29, & 675 § 1.

[23] *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, nos. 782 & 1267, cf. also nos.1213 & 1214.

The liturgy of the word and the liturgy of the sacraments not only make the Church, but also manifest it in a visible manner, especially in the celebration of the Eucharist. Thus the community of the faithful gathered together under the sacred ministry of bishop for the celebration of the Eucharist, is the greatest manifestation of the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church. We quote in full the important text of *Lumen Gentium*:

> This Church of Christ is truly present in all the lawful congregations of the faithful which, united to their shepherds, are themselves called churches in the New Testament. For in their own locality, these are the new people called by God in the Holy Spirit and with full conviction (see 1 Thes. 1, 5). In these the faithful are gathered together by the preaching of the gospel of Christ and the mystery of the Lord's supper is celebrated 'so that the whole fellowship is joined together through the flesh and blood of the Lord's body'. In any community of the altar, under the sacred ministry of the bishop, there is made manifest the symbol of that charity and 'unity of the mystical body without which there can be no salvation'. In these communities, although frequently small and poor, or dispersed, Christ is present by whose power the one, holy catholic and apostolic church is gathered together (LG 26).

This fact is further confirmed by the recent magisterium of the Church: "The Church is the people that God gathers in the whole world. She exists in local communities and is made real as a liturgical, above all a eucharistic assembly. She draws her life from the word and the body of Christ and so herself becomes Christ's Body".[24] In short, the Church has a sacramental or liturgical foundation; we enter the Church sacramentally, sacramentally we continue to be in the Church and live from the Church.[25]

---

[24] *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, no. 752.

[25] Cf. J. M. R. TILLARD, "The Church of God is a Communion, The Ecclesiological Perspective of Vatican II", *One in Christ* 17 (1981) 120.

1.4. The Church as a Communion Effected by Liturgy

The most fundamental ecclesiological principle of Vatican II is that the Church is a communion or *koinonia.*[26] The 1985 Synod of Bishops in its final report categorically affirmed that "the ecclesiology of communion is the central and fundamental idea of the Council's documents" and much effort has been made, so that the Church as communion might be more clearly understood and concretely incorporated into life.[27] The idea of communion or *koinonia* is fundamental for the comprehension of the Church because the Church exists as communion. In other words, the very *being* of the Church is communion, namely the communion of the faithful with the triune God - Father, Son and Holy Spirit - and the communion of the faithful among themselves. The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith in its document, *Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,* states that in the biblical and patristic traditions communion always involves two dimensions: the vertical (communion with God) and the horizontal (communion among men).[28]

---

[26] For a detailed discussion A. ACERBI, *Due ecclesiologie: ecclesiologia giuridica e ecclesiologia di comunione nella "Lumen gentium"*, Bolonga 1976,13-553; TILLARD, "The Church of God is a Communion", 117-118; B. P. PRUSAK, "Hospitality Extended or Denied, Koinonia Incarnate from Jesus to Augustine", *The Jurist* 36 (1976), 124; KILMARTIN, *Particular Liturgy of the Individual Church*, Bangalore 1987, 51-68; A. ANTON, "Post Conciliar Ecclesiology: Expectations, Results, and Prospects for the Future", in R. LATOURELLE, *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives Twenty-Five Years After (1962-1987)*, New York 1988, 421-424.

[27] The 1985 Synod of Bishops, Relatio finalis, II, C, 1: "Ecclesiologia communionis idea centralis ac fundamentalis in documentis concilii est. Koinonia/ communio, in S. Scriptura fundata, in Ecclesia antiqua et in Ecclesiis Orientalibus usque ad nostros dies magno honore habentur. Inde a Concilio Vaticano II multum factum est ut Ecclesia tamquam communio clarius intellegeretur ac magis concrete traduceretur in vitam".

[28] Congregatio pro Doctrina Fidei, Litterae ad Catholicae Ecclesiae episcopos de aliquibus aspectibus Ecclesiae prout es communio, 28 Maii 1992, no. 3, AAS 85 (1993) 839; HAMER, *L'Eglise est une communion*, Paris 1962, 191; *Comunione* e *comunità*, Piano pastorale

Such a communion with God and among the faithful cannot be effected by external social administrative structures or canonical institutions, but only by the liturgy, namely the holy Eucharist and the sacraments because the Church is not a club of friends who meet together for entertainment nor a charitable association which works on the basis of its own statutes to provide humanitarian help nor a political party which acts on the basis of an ideology and programme for power. Nobody can become a member of the Church by inscribing their names in the register books to be kept in the archives of the curia as in a pious association or in a political party, but only by the celebration of liturgy.

1.4.1. Communion through the Same Baptism

The origin of the Church-communion is the celebration of Baptism. By the liturgy of baptism a person participates in the paschal mystery of Christ, namely in his death and resurrection, and shares in his priestly, prophetic and royal function. Baptism is only one, and the effects of baptism are the same in spite of the differences in its liturgical celebration according to the different traditions or rites. All those who have received baptism validly participate in the same paschal mystery of Christ, share in the same priestly, prophetic and royal function of Christ and receive the same new life of Christ. Therefore, all the baptized enter into communion with the same Jesus Christ, and thus there results an ontological sacramental communion of all the baptized in the world, though this communion cannot be properly expressed because of the limitations of time and space.[29] By baptism Jesus becomes our brother, God our Father, Holy Spirit our life, and all the baptized brothers and sisters, inspite of the variations of colour, race, culture, economic status

---

communion, Paris 1962, 191; *Comunione* e *comunità*, Piano pastorale della CEI per gli anno 80, magistero no.72, Edizioni Paoline 1987, 15.

[29] Cf. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, no.1271; CEI,*Comunione e comunità*, 18.

and national, continental divergences. As writes St Paul, in Jesus Christ

> you are all sons of God, through faith. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus.[30]

Thus there is a fundamental equality among all the Christian faithful (i.e. bishops, priests, religious and laity).[31] In short, baptism is the first instance of ontological communion with the triune God and among all the faithful of Christ, and therefore the fundamental internal basis of the unity of the universal Church.

1.4.2. Communion through the Sacrament of Confirmation

By the liturgy of baptism and confirmation (or Chrismation with holy myron) the faithful also receive the Holy Spirit and become sons of God. For all who are led by the Spirit of God are sons of God. When we cry, "Abba! Father" it is the Spirit himself bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God.[32] The same Holy Spirit abides in all, though his gifts are different. This is clearly pointed out by St Paul in his first epistle to the Corinthians:

> Now there are varieties of gifts, but the same Spirit; ....to each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good. To one is given through the Spirit the utterance of wisdom, and to another the utterance of knowledge according to the same Spirit, to another faith by the same Spirit, to another gifts of healing by the one Spirit ...all these are inspired by one and the same Spirit, who apportions to each one individually as he wills. For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ. For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body - Jews or

---

30 Gal. 3, 26-29; Cf. Col. 3, 11; Eph. 2, 13-22.

31 Cf. CCEO c. 11; CIC c. 208.

32 Cf. Rom. 8, 14-17; Gal. 5, 16-18.

> Greeks, slaves or free - and all were made to drink of one Spirit" (1 Cor.12, 4-13).

The same Spirit who abides in all, binds together the Christian faithful with God and among themselves and thus constitutes the Church. According to St Cyril of Alexandria,

> All of us who have received one and the same Spirit, that is, the Holy Spirit, are in a sense blended together with one another and with God. For if Christ, together with the Father's and his own Spirit, comes to dwell in each of us, though we are many, still the Spirit is one and undivided. He binds together the spirits of each and every one of us,...and makes all appear as one in him. For just as the power of Christ's sacred flesh unites those in whom it dwells into one body, I think that in the same way the one and undivided Spirit of God, who dwells in all, leads all into spiritual unity.[33]

1.4.3. Communion through the Eucharist

The vertical communion with the triune God and the horizontal communion of the faithful are realized and manifested in an eminent manner in the celebration of the eucharistic liturgy, the sacrament of the sacraments and the source and summit of Christian life. In the eucharistic celebration the triune God-Father, Son and Holy Spirit - becomes present in the Christian community in a very special manner. In every eucharistic celebration we find the presence of the triune God - the Father to whom the sacrifice is offered, the Holy Spirit who transforms the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ and the Son incarnated who becomes actually present in the form of bread and wine. In the Eucharist we experience "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God the Father and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit".[34]

---

[33] St CYRIL Of Alexandria, In Joannis Evangelium 11, 11: PG 74, 561.

[34] *The Syro-Malabar Qurbana,The Order of Raza*, 1989, 37 & 49; cf.*Messale Romano*, 293.

The presence of the Father: in the eucharistic celebration *we offer to the Father* what he has himself given us: the gifts of his creation, bread and wine which have become the body and blood of Christ. Thus the Eucharist is a sacrifice of thanksgiving to the Father, a blessing by which the Church expresses her gratitude to God for all his benefits, for all that he has accomplished through creation, redemption and sanctification.[35] All the eucharistic prayers of the Latin Church are addressed to the Father. In other liturgies also most of the prayers are addressed to the "Lord, God Almighty". Similarly it is the Father who sends the Holy Spirit to transform the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ.[36] By the celebration of the Eucharist "through him, with him and in him, in the unity of the Holy Spirit" we offer to the almighty Father all glory and honour.[37]

The presence of Christ: though Christ is present in many ways to his Church, he is present in the Eucharist in a most special manner.[38] "The mode of Christ's presence under the eucharistic species is unique. ...In the most blessed sacrament of the Eucharist 'the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ and, therefore, the whole Christ is truly, really and substantially contained' ... it is presence in the fullest sense: that is to say, it is a *substantial* presence by which Christ, God and man, makes himself wholly and entirely present".[39]

---

[35] Cf.*Catechism of the Catholic Church,* nos. 1356-1361.

[36] *The Syro-Malabar Qurbana, The Order of Raza,* 44-45; *Messale Romano,* 394, 401 & 413; *The Byzantine Liturgy, A New English Translation of the Liturgies of St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil the Great,* Second edition, New York 1986, 47.

[37] Cf., *Messale Romano,* all the eucharistic prayers of the Latin Church end with this doxology.

[38] *Sacrosanctum Concilium,* no.7.

[39] *Catechism of the Catholic Church,* no. 1374; See also Council of Trent, Decree on the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, in N. P. TANNER ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils,* vol. 2, London, 1990, 693;.Pope PAUL VI, *Mysterium Fidei,* AAS 57 (1965) 762-766.

The Presence of the Holy Spirit: in all the liturgies it is the Holy Spirit who transforms the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ.[40] The Latin Church which adopted the Aristotelian scholastic hylomorphism, explained the sacraments in terms of matter and form and sufficient importance was not given to the pneumatological dimension of the sacraments, especially epiclesis in the eucharistic liturgy. But epiclesis does exist in the Latin liturgy. In the most often used eucharistic prayer we pray to the Father invoking the Holy Spirit,

> Lord, you are holy indeed, the fountain of all holiness. Let your Spirit come upon these gifts to make them holy, so that they may become for us the body and blood of our Lord, Jesus Christ.[41]

In the official document of the Italian episcopal conference, *Eucaristia, comunione e comunità* we read,

> The Eucharist is the fruit of the power of the Holy Spirit. Invoked by the community gathered in prayer, the Spirit transforms the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, renews the life of those who participate in the sacrifice and moulds the Church as a community.[42]

The same document repeats "The Holy Spirit has overshadowed the Virgin Mary so that she might conceive in her womb the body of Christ. Invoked by the assembly, he intervenes as divine energy on the gifts of bread and wine to transform them into the body and blood of Christ. He acts as the fire of love on all of us,

---

[40] The consecratory character of epiclesis is a well accepted fact in all the oriental liturgical traditions. Even according to oriental canon law the sacraments are actions of the Holy Spirit, see CCEO cc. 667, 675 § 1, 692, 698, 718, 743. It is difficult to believe that the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ differently in the oriental liturgies and in the Latin Liturgy. In all the liturgies it is the Holy Spirit who transforms the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ in the same manner and in the same intensity.

[41] The second Eucharistic Prayer, *Messale Romano*, 394; Epiclesis explicitly exists also in the third and fourth eucharistic prayers of the Latin Church, see *Messale Romano*, 401 & 413.

[42] *Eucaristia, comunione e comunità,* Documento pastorale dell'episcopato italiano, Magistero 96, Edizioni Paoline 1987, 4.

in order to transform us in to members of Christ and place us vitally in his ecclesial body".[43] *The Catechism of the Catholic Church* has the following to say about the presence of the Holy Spirit in the eucharistic liturgy.

> *Epiclesis* ('invocation upon') is the intercession in which the priest begs the Father to send the Holy Spirit, the Sanctifier, so that the offerings may become the body and blood of Christ and that the faithful by receiving them, may themselves become a living offering to God.[44]

In this regard the words of St John Damascene is highly enlightening: "You ask how the bread becomes the Body of Christ, and the wine... the Blood of Christ. I shall tell you: the Holy Spirit comes upon them and accomplishes what surpasses every word and thought... Let it be enough for you to understand that it is by the Holy Spirit, just as it was of the Holy Virgin and by the Holy Spirit the Lord, through and in himself, took flesh".[45]

Since Father, Son and Holy Spirit are present in the eucharistic community in an intense manner, the faithful enters into direct communion with the triune God in the eucharistic liturgy. This communion is so intimate and real that the faithful receive Christ himself in their heart and thus Christ and the believer become one. Jesus himself revealed during the eucharistic discourse that "He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me and I in him. As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so he who eats me will live because of me" (Jn. 6, 56-57). Thus the faithful realise, in the words of Jesus himself that "I am in my Father, and you in me, and I in you" (Jn. 14, 20) and that "If a man loves me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our home with him" (Jn. 14, 23). Therefore the

---

[43] Ibidem, 17.

[44] *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, no. 1105; cf. also no. 1353.

[45] St. JOHN DAMASCENE, *De fide orthodoxa*, 4, 13: PG 94, 1145.

communion with God is realised in an eminent manner in the eucharistic liturgy.

Similarly the horizontal communion of the faithful is also realised and manifested in the eucharistic liturgy. All the faithful who share in the same body of Christ and the same blood of Christ, become one "even as we are one" (Jn. 11, 11) and really become the body of Christ, namely the Church. In the first letter to the Corinthians, St Paul writes: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ? Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread" (1 Cor. 10, 16-17). In the divine liturgy is realised what Jesus prayed: "that they all be one; even as you Father, are in me, and I in you, that they also may be in us, so that the world may believe that thou hast sent me" (Jn. 17, 21). "Those who receive the Eucharist are united more closely to Christ. Through it Christ unites them to all the faithful in one body - the Church. Communion renews, strengthens, and deepens this incorporation into the Church, already achieved by Baptism".[46]

J. Ratzinger explains well how the Eucharist binds together the Christian faithful and makes the Church. "Communion signifies that the apparently insurmountable barrier of my ego is broken and can be broken since Jesus has firstly wished to open the whole of himself, has received us all within himself and has given himself wholly to us. Therefore, communion signifies fusion of existences; as in nourishment the body can assimilate an external substance and thus live, so my ego is "assimilated" to Jesus himself, made similar to him in an exchange which evermore breaks the line of separation. All those who receive the communion are assimilated to this "bread" and become thus among them one thing only: a unique body. In this manner opening the walls of subjectivity and uniting us in a profound and existential communion the Eucharist makes the

[46] *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, no. 1396; cf. the same idea in Pope John Paul II, *Dominicae Cenae*, no.4, AAS 72 (1980) 120.

Church. Through it takes place the "assembly" by which the Lord unites us. The formula "the Church is the body of Christ" affirms therefore that the Eucharist, in which the Lord gives us his body and makes of us a single body, is the place of uninterrupted birth of the Church, in which he always establishes it again; in the Eucharist the Church is she herself in the more intense manner; in all the places and nevertheless one only, so he is only one".[47]

In short, the vertical communion with God and the horizontal communion among the faithful are realized and manifested in Eucharist and thus the Church really comes into being. "By means of faith, the Spirit of Christ unites the believer to the body of the Church, in which the salvific act of Christ is constantly made present through the eucharistic memorial. Participation in the eucharistic memorial in turn reconciles or, to put it more precisely, accomplishes the reconciliation of the Christian with God, and through Christ the saviour and his Spirit creates or effects permanent communion with the Father and with all those who belong to Christ. Here we have the essence of the Church: in a vertical sense, it is divine communion, through Christ in the Spirit with the Father, and, in a horizontal sense, it is human and ecclesial communion with all those who live in divine communion. This divine and human communion is the theandric unity of Christ as brought about mystically in his body, which is the Church".[48]

2. The Eparchial Eucharistic Community as the Basic Unit of the Church

We have already seen that Church is a communion in the vertical and horizontal levels and this communion is effected and manifested by the sacraments, especially by the Eucharist. Now parish is also a liturgical community, but presided over by a

---

[47] J. RATZINGER, *La Chiesa una comunità sempre in commino*, 25-26; cf. *Il nuovo popolo di Dio*, 91-93: cf. also the document of the Italian episcopal conference, *Eucaristia, comunione e comunità*, 91-93.

[48] GERARDO J. BÉKÉS, "The Eucharist Makes the Church...", 356.

presbyter. Naturally the question arises concerning the eucharistic community that exists as the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church in a particular locality.

According to the tradition of the Church, both oriental and occidental, only the episcopal diocese is considered as the basic unit of the Church. Episcopal ministry is necessary for a perfect unit of the Church and the parish *per se* lacks the immediate presence of the episcopal ministry and consequently the fullness of sacramental ministry.[49] Besides, the apostolicity of a Church is guaranteed by the bishop and not by the presbyter, because bishops are the successors of the apostles and they connect their particular Churches with the apostolic Tradition and apostolic Faith. According to LG no. 20, the bishops in virtue of

> the unbroken succession, going back to the beginning, are regarded as transmitters of the apostolic line. Thus, according to the testimony of St Iranaeus, the apostolic tradition is manifested and preserved in the whole world by those who were made bishops by the apostles and by their successors down to our own time.

In the official document of the Italian episcopal conference, *Eucharistia, Comunione e comunità,* we read: "It is the bishop who ensures the relationship with the apostolic community and therefore, the identity of our 'Eucharist' with that which Christ has celebrated together with the Twelve. Through the will of Christ, the local Church, originating from the Eucharist, builds up itself around the person and ministry of the apostle".[50] Therefore in his Church, no Eucharist may be celebrated in truth unless it be presided over by him, or by a presbyter in communion with him. Therefore presbyters and deacons who also participate in the same priesthood of Christ and receive their

---

[49] Cf. E. LANNE, "L'Eglise locale et l'Eglise universelle", *Irénikon* 43 (1970), 490-491; K. RAHNER & J. RATZINGER, *Episcopat und Primat,* Freiburg-Wasel-Wien 1961, 28; G. NEDUNGATT, "Ecclesia universialis, particularis, singularis", *Nuntia* 2 (1976) 79.

[50] CEI, *Eucharistia, Comunione e comunità,* 27; This affirmation is based on *Istruzione Generale Messale Romano,* no. 74.

powers from Christ himself through sacramental ordination have to exercise their powers in communion with the bishop.[51]

The reciprocal relationship between the bishop and his Church is also evident in the early tradition.[52] The bishop and the Church are even identified by Fathers like Cyprian who said "the bishop is in the Church and the Church is in the bishop".[53] St Ignatius wrote to the Smyrneans: "That only is the true Eucharist which is celebrated under the bishop or him whom he commissions. Where the bishop is, there the assembly should be, because where Christ Jesus is, there is the Catholic Church".[54] According to Karl Rahner, the earliest local Church was also an episcopal Church, whereby we must also remember that the episcopacy is *iuris divini.* On the other hand, the presbyters were not those people one needed because there were many local communities; they were the bishop's senate, which was plural from its very beginning. Hence, the original local community contained only divinely founded elements, the holy, liturgical community of Christ with an Apostle or his successor at the summit.[55]

The importance of episcopal ministry for a perfect Church unit is clear in Vatican II:

> In any community of the altar, *under the sacred ministry of the bishop,* there is made manifest the symbol of that charity and unity of the mystical body without which there can be no salvation. In these communities, though they may be often small and poor, or existing in the diaspora, Christ is present

---

[51] Cf.J. M. R. TILLARD, "The Church of God is a Communion..", 125.

[52] Didascalia II, 26, 1-8.

[53] Epistle, 66, ad Pupian 8; PL, 4, p. 418: "Unde scire debes episcopum in Ecclesia esse et Ecclesia in episcopo, et si quis cum episcopo non sit, in Ecclesia non esse...".

[54] As quoted in L. HERTLING, *Communio: Church and Papacy in Early Christianity, tr.* with an introduction by J. WICKS, Chicago 1962, 46.

[55] KARL RAHNER, "Theology of the Parish" in Hugo Rahner, ed., *The Parish, Westminister 1958, 30.*

> through whose power and influence the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church is constituted (LG 26).

According to *Sacrosanctum Concilium* the liturgical celebration, presided over by the bishop and surrounded by his college of priests and ministers and the Christian faithful is the principal manifestation of the Church.[56]

Though family (LG 11b) and parish (PO 6d) are called "Church" in Vatican II, they are not considered as "particular Churches" in relation to universal Church. Only the diocese is called particular Church and is considered as the fundamental ecclesial unit. It is only in a community of the altar, under the sacred ministry of the bishop that the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church of Christ is truly present and at work. This is also clear from the definition of particular Church in *Christus Dominus*:

> A diocese is a section of the people of God whose pastoral care is entrusted to a bishop in cooperation with his priests. Thus, in conjunction with their pastor and gathered by him into one flock in the Holy Spirit through the Gospel and the Eucharist, they constitute a particular Church. In this Church the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church of Christ is truly present and at work.[57]

The bishops are the "visible principle and foundation of unity in their own particular Churches which are constituted after the model of the universal Church" and so "each bishop represents his own Church"(LG 23). Other communities, like family and parish, are not complete in themselves; they are related to the diocese in the strict sense and in communion with it. According to Orthodox theologians also, the parish, family or other Christian groups are not Church in the "full" and Catholic sense. The complete ecclesiological status of a local Church requires the presence of a bishop and thus only a diocese is

---

[56] SC 41; Cf. also LG 26.

[57] CD 11a; Cf. CCEO c. 177 § 1; CIC c. 368. Besides this LG n. 27, CD n. 3b and 36a speak of the relationship between bishop and particular Church.

properly called a Church.[58] A eucharistic community in which the bishop presides and the priests, deacons, religious and the Christian faithful participate (at least in a representative manner) is the greatest manifestation of the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church in the local level.

A bishop is ordained for a particular Church or eparchy in order to exercise his sacramental, teaching and pastoral functions. It is in the presiding at the Eucharist that the ministry of the bishops is most evident. The main function of the bishop, as successor of the apostles who considered "it is not right that we should give up preaching the word of God to serve tables" (Acts 6, 2), is the ministry of the word and celebration of the sacraments in the proper manner according to the prescriptions of the liturgical books and the tradition of each Church; and to form his Church as a liturgical or worshipping community in the manner of the apostolic community of the Acts.[59] Apostles were not administrators, and the successors of the apostles, the bishops cannot engage in administrative matters, neglecting the preaching of the word and proper celebration of the sacraments.

3. The Patriarchal Churches and Similar Intermediary Communions

We have already seen that an eparchial eucharistic community presided over by the bishop is by *iure divino* the

---

58 Cf.J. D. ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion: Studies in the Personhood and the Church*, London 1985, 24-25 and 247-253; G. TSETSIS, *Orthodox Thought: Reports of Orthodox Consultations Organized by WCC 1975-1982*, Geneva 1983,24; A. SCHMEMANN, "La notion de primauté dans l'ecclésiologie orthodoxe", in *La primauté de Pierre dans l'Eglise orthodoxe*, Neuchtel 1960, 128-130; J. H. ERICKSON, "Common Comprehension of Christians Concerning Autonomy and Central Power in the Church in View of Orthodox Theology", *Kanon* 4 (1980) 101-102; N. AFANASSIEFF, "Statio orbis", *Irénikon* 35 (1961), 67.

59 For the obligations of bishops concerning the proper celebration of liturgy, P. PALLATH, "The Obligations of All Christian Faithful regarding the Preservation of the Heritage of their Church, *Christian Orient* (June 1992) 115-116.

fundamental unit of the Church. Therefore, other super episcopal structures like the patriarchates are communions of eparchial eucharistic communities, having a foundation in *ius divinum*.[60] From the very beginning of Christianity the eparchial bishops of the same locality having the same historical, geographical, cultural, political and sociological circumstances used to assemble in synods both in the West and in the East to solve the problems that confronted the early Church. Such assemblies were normally held at the center of the locality or metropolis and presided over by the metropolitan or another bishop of great fame and sanctity. Thus even before the Council of Nicaea (325), the metropolitan system and provincial synods emerged spontaneously. The Council of Nicaea and the subsequent ecumenical councils officially recognized the metropolitan system and the synodal governance of the local Churches. The promulgation of laws for the province, the election and ordination of bishops, the judgment or deposition of bishops, the erection of new eparchies, as well as the examination and judgements of appeals were the competencies of provincial synods.[61]

In the same way certain sees, important because of their apostolic origin, favourable geographical situation, politico-cultural importance and flourishing ecclesial life, or because they gave birth to other filial Churches through evangelization, gradually emerged as patriarchates and the episcopal bodies of these Churches were called patriarchal synods. The Council of Nicaea (325) recognized the super metropolitan prerogatives of Rome, Alexandria and Antioch (c.6). The First Council of Constantinople (381) confirmed the prerogatives of these great sees and attributed the second position of honour to Constantinople (c.2). With the Council of Chalcedon (451) the

---

[60] K. RAHNER, "The Episcopal Office", *Theological Investigations*, vol. 6, Baltimore 1961, 355-356; A. ANTON, *Le conferenze episcopali: instanze intermedie?* Milano 1992, 213-324.

[61] For the gradual evolution of the metropolitan system and synodal structure, P. PALLATH, *The Synod of Bishops of Catholic Oriental Churches*, Rome 1994, 87-100 & 103-104.

prerogatives of these great sees were definitively fixed and Jerusalem emerged as the fifth patriarchate (cc.9,17,28). Outside the Roman Empire the Chaldean Church and the Armenian Church emerged as catholicates or patriarchates. With the emergence of the patriarchates some of the powers hitherto enjoyed by the provincial synods were automatically assumed by the patriarchal synods. The patriarchal synods enjoyed wide legislative, judicial, electoral and administrative powers over the entire patriarchal Church. Thus the Christian centers like Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Constantinople, Chaldea and Armenia gradually became great Churches developing their own liturgy, theology, spirituality and discipline.[62]

Vatican II recognized the intermediary communions like patriarchates and their equivalents as they existed in the first millennium. An accurate scrutiny of the three documents of Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium, Orientalium Ecclesiarum and Unitatis Redintegratio* which determine the nature, structure and constitution of the Church, demonstrates the recognition of intermediary structures like patriarchates and their equivalents, especially in relation to Oriental Churches.

According to LG article 23d:

> It has come out through divine providence that, in course of time, different Churches set up in various places by the apostles and their successors joined together in a multiplicity of organically united groups which, whilst safeguarding the unity of the faith and the unique divine structure of the universal Church, have their own discipline, enjoy their own liturgical usage and inherit a theological and spiritual patrimony. Some of these, notably the ancient patriarchal Churches, as mothers in faith, gave birth to their daughter-Churches, as it were, and down to our own days they are linked with these by bonds of a more intimate charity in what pertains to the sacramental life and in a mutual respect for rights and obligations.

---

62 Cf. P.PALLATH, *The Synod of Bishops of Catholic Oriental Churches*, 105-109.

It is clear that the organically united groups of Churches with their own liturgical, theological, spiritual and disciplinary patrimony, of which the Council speaks, are not dioceses, but the intermediary structures such as the ancient patriarchal Churches.[63] The Council also accepts that these institutions have been developed according to divine providence.

The existence of intermediate structures is more evident in *Orientalium Ecclesiarum.* According to OE, "The holy Catholic Church, which is the mystical body of Christ, is made up of the faithful who are organically united in the Holy Spirit by the same faith, the same sacraments and the same government. They combine into different groups, which are held together by their hierarchy and so form particular Churches or rites" (OE 2).

As is clear from the third article, "particular Church" is a common term applicable to both Latin and Oriental Churches. "These particular Churches both Eastern and Western while they differ somewhat among themselves in what is called "rite", namely in liturgy, in ecclesiastical discipline, and in spiritual tradition, are none the less all equally entrusted to the pastoral guidance of the Roman Pontiff" (OE 3).

Unitatis Redintegratio recognizes the non-Catholic Oriental Churches as particular Churches and considers them as intermediate ecclesial communions: "The Council gladly reminds everyone of the highly significant fact among others: in the East there flourish many particular local Churches; among them the patriarchal Churches hold first place, and of them many glory in taking their origins from the apostles themselves" (UR 14). The

---

[63] Cf. G. PHILIPS, *L'Eglise et son mystère au II concile du Vatican,* vol.1, Paris 1967, 313-314; K. MÖRSDORF, "L'autonomia della Chiesa locale", in *Atti del congresso internazionale di diritto canonico: La Chiesa dopo il concilio,* Roma 1970, 183-184; W. DE VRIES, "Die Patriarchate des Ostens: Bestimmende Faktoren bei ihrer Entstehung", in *I Patriarcati orientali nell primo millennio,* OCA 181 (1968), 33: B. P. PRUSAK, *The Canonical Concept of Particular Church before and after Vatican II,* Rome 1967, 97-99; D. FARIS, *The Communion of Catholic Churches: Terminology and Ecclesiology,* Brooklyn-New York 1985, 34-38.

Eastern Orthodox Churches, "though separated from the See of Peter, remain united to the Catholic Church by means of very close bonds, such as the apostolic succession and a valid Eucharist, and therefore merit the title of particular Churches".[64]

The constitution and governance of the Catholic Eastern Churches are clearly defined by *Codex Canonum Ecclesiarum Orientalium*, promulgated by Pope John Paul II with the apostolic constitution "Sacri canones" on 18 October 1990.[65] According to this Code, between the eparchies and universal Church, there exist intermediary communions or *Churches sui iuris* like the patriarchal, major archiepiscopal, and metropolitan Churches. Presenting the Code to the Synod of bishops on 25 October 1990, the Pope himself stated that "it will be regarded as belonging to the disciplinary wealth of the Universal Church on an equal status with the *Codex Iuris Canonici* promulgated in 1983"; and the Latin Code, the Oriental Code and the *Pastor Bonus* together form a single "corpus iuris canonici".[66] Therefore, the constitution of the Catholic Church cannot be decided only on the basis of the Latin Code which admits only a two tier structure of the Church, namely dioceses and the universal Church. If the above-mentioned three canonical documents promulgated by the same supreme authority together form the law of the Universal Church and if the Eastern Catholic Churches also belong to the universal Church, the constitution and governance as defined by the Oriental Code also belong to the Universal Church. Thus the constitution of the Church admits a three tier structure: the diocesan Churches (*Ecclesia particularis*) the intermediary communions like the patriarchal

---

[64] Litterae ad Catholicae Ecclesiae episcopos de aliquibus aspectibus Ecclesiae prout es communio, no. 17, AAS 85 (1993) 848.

[65] AAS 82 (1990) 1033-1053.

[66] *L'Osservatore Romano,* weekly English edition, November 5, 1990; The original Latin text in *L'Osservatore Romano,* 27 October 1990, 4-5.

Churches and their equivalents (*Ecclesia sui iuris*)[67] and the Universal Church (*Ecclesia universalis).* As a result the universal Church is the communion of the Latin Church and the different oriental Churches.

From what we have already seen, the following points become evident: (1) Between the dioceses and the universal Church, there exist intermediary structures like patriarchates and their equivalents. These intermediary structures which originated spontaneously in the early Church were recognized and confirmed by the supreme authority of the Church, especially by the first seven ecumenical councils. (2) The uniting elements of these Churches are the same faith, the same sacraments and the same hierarchical government under the Roman Pontiff who is the visible principle of unity and the guarantee of communion. (3) These Churches differ in liturgy, theology, spirituality and discipline which in fact constitute their distinctive identity and individuality. (4) The Latin Church is also a particular Church (or *sui iuris* Church) which extends all over the world having its own liturgical, theological, spiritual and disciplinary heritage. (5) The Universal Church is the communion of all the particular Churches of the East and West.

4. Liturgy and the Unity of the Universal Church

The statement that the universal Church is the communion of particular Churches does not mean that it is an amalgamation or confederation of particular Churches or *Ecclesiae sui iuris.* The unity of the universal Church derives from the internal essential ontological nature of the Church herself, constituted by the liturgy (sacraments) and not from any external structures nor canonical institutions. How does liturgy constitute the unity of the universal Church? As we have seen above, there is an ontological unity among all the Christian faithful all over the world, because there is only one baptism and

[67] The Latin Church, though it extends all over the world, is an *Ecclesia sui iuris* regulated by the *Code of Canon Law* or a Particular Church in the sense of Vatican II.

through the liturgy of baptism all participate in the same paschal mystery of Christ, all share in the same priestly, royal and prophetic function of Christ and all become sons of God.

Similarly through baptism and Chrismation with holy myron (confirmation) all receive the same Holy Spirit, though the gifts and charisms of the Spirit are different. Therefore we can say that "the Church is one *because of her 'soul'* : it is the Holy Spirit, dwelling in those who believe and pervading and ruling over the entire Church, who brings about that wonderful communion of the faithful and joins them together so intimately in Christ that he is the principle of the Church's unity".[68]

The same Holy Trinity, the same Christ who is the head and founder of the Church, is fully, equally and entirely present in all the eucharistic celebrations all over the world, and all the Christian faithful share in the same body and blood of Christ, and thus become the body of Christ, namely the universal Church.[69] St Ignatius wrote to the Philadelphians: "Be zealous to celebrate the one Eucharist. For the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ is one, and he gives the one cup of his blood for our unity".[70] Thus the "oneness and indivisibility of the eucharistic body of the Lord implies the oneness of his mystical body, which is the one and indivisible Church".[71] The decree on ecumenism *Unitatis Redintegratio* also confirms our affirmation: "in his Church he instituted the wonderful sacrament of the Eucharist by which the unity of the Church is both signified and brought about" (no. 2).

The unity of the Church also derives from the unity of the episcopate. The Apostolicity of a Church is also guaranteed

---

68 *Catechism of the Catholic Church,* no. 813; Cf. UR 2; also CEI, *Comunione e comunità,* 17.

69 The same Christ is present in the eucharistic liturgy and the faithful share in the same body and blood of Christ in Africa, America, Asia, Antarctica and Europe.

70 As quoted L. HERTLING, *Communio: Church and Papacy in Early Chriatianity,* 46.

71 Litterae ad Catholicae Ecclesiae episcopos de aliquibus aspectibus Ecclesiae prout es communio, no. 11, AAS 85 (1993) 845.

by the liturgical celebration of the sacrament of Orders. A person becomes a bishop and the successor of the apostolic college and thus the possessor of apostolic Tradition and Apostolic Faith through the celebration of the sacrament of Orders. No other method is known to the Church that may make a person successor of the apostles. All the bishops share in their own manner in the same priesthood of Christ through the sacrament of Orders and there is fundamental ontological unity among all the bishops of the universal Church. The Episcopal college succeeds the apostolic college. This college is constituted by the Sacrament of Order. The episcopate is one and undivided.[72] Through their communion in the same sacrament all members of the college share a communion in the one and same priesthood of Christ, a communion in the one and same universal mission of ministry, and in the one and same responsibility and office, all together committed by Christ to the same college, to which he assigned a head.[73] W. Bertrams is of the opinion that just as baptism constitutes an ontological communion of the faithful, the episcopal consecration in its substantial ontological reality constitutes a communion that unites the bishops with Christ and among themselves in the ministry of word and sacraments.[74] Thus the unity of the universal Church also derives from the unity of the episcopate.

---

[72] St. CYPRIAN, "De Unitate Ecclesiae, 5, PL 4, 516-517; *Lumen Gentium,* 18; Litterae ad Catholicae Ecclesiae episcopos de aliquibus aspectibus Ecclesiae prout es communio, no. 12, AAS 85 (1993) 845-846; D. T. STROTMANN, "Der Bischof in der Ostkirchlichen Überlieferung", *Una Sancta* 16 (1961) 259.

[73] Cf. T. J. URRESTY, "The Ontology of Communion and Collegial Structures in the Church", *Concilium* 1 (1965) 6; U. BETTI, "Il papa e gli altri membri del collegio", in G. BARAUNA, *La Chiesa del vaticano II,* Firenze 1965, 765; G. GRESHAKE, "Die Stellung des Protos in der sicht der Römischkatholischen dogmatischen Theologie", *Kanon* 9 (1989) 20; W. KASPER, "Der theologische Status der Bishofskonferenzen", TQ 167 (1987) 3.

[74] Cf. W. BERTRAMS, *Questiones fundamentales iuris canonici,* Rome 1969,.447-449; "Communio, communitas et societas in lege fundamentali Ecclesiae", *Periodica* 61 (1972), 553-604; De potestatis episcopatis exercitio personali et collegiali", *Periodica* 53 (1964), 380.

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* states that the unity of the pilgrim Church is also assured by visible bonds of communion, namely "profession of the one faith received from the apostles; common celebration of the divine worship, especially of the sacraments; apostolic succession through the sacrament of Holy Orders, maintaining the fraternal concord of God's family".[75] All the Churches within the Catholic communion have the same faith, though the theological formulations or approaches are different; the same seven sacraments, though the mode of celebration is different according to the different rites developed on the basis of apostolic Christ experience and the socio-cultural philosophical milieu of each place; and the same hierarchical government under the Roman Pontiff, though the mode of governing is different.

According to the divine constitution of the Church, the pope who is the successor of St Peter and head of the episcopal college is "the perpetual and visible principle and foundation *(perpetuum ac visibile principium et fundamentum)* of the unity" of the universal Church.[76] As the head of the universal Church by *iure divino* and as the guarantee of faith and communion, the pope always acts to safeguard the unity of the Church in case of disagreements in faith and discipline.[77] For this purpose, according to catholic canon law, he enjoys "supreme, full, immediate and universal ordinary power in the Church which he can always freely exercise".[78] A eucharistic liturgy celebrated by the pope, the visible head of the Church, together with the bishops of the entire world (at least in a representative manner) would be the greatest manifestation of the universal Church. Similarly the ecumenical council, which is the assembly of all the bishops of the Universal Church, also manifests it in a visible

---

[75] *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, no.815.

[76] *Lumen Gentium*, no.23.

[77] Cf. *Unitatis Redintegratio*, no.14.

[78] CIC c. 331; CCEO c. 43.

manner.[79] Therefore, the unity of the universal Church derives fundamentally from the internal essential divine nature of the Church, constituted by the celebration of the liturgy, of which the pope is the visible principle and foundation. In short, "there is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the one hope that belongs to your call, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and father of us all, who is above all and through all and in all" (Eph. 4, 4-6)).

5. The Church and External Organizational Structures

Vatican II affirms that the Church is at the same time "the visible society and the spiritual community", but they form a single complex reality which comes together from a human and divine element. This social structure of the Church serves "the Spirit of Christ who vivifies it in the building up of the body (cf. Eph. 4, 15)".[80] Both codes of canon law also point out that the Church exists as a visible society: "The Church, constituted and organized as a society in this world, subsists in the Catholic Church, governed by the successor of Peter and the bishops in communion with him".[81]

Since the Church effected by the preaching of the word and the celebration of the sacraments exists in this world as a communion of human persons or as a visible society, it needs laws, social structures and canonical institutions to mould and organize itself in a better, orderly and efficient manner just as other human societies. Speaking about the necessity of canon law Pope John Paul II writes:

> Since the Church is established in the form of a social and visible unit, it needs rules, so that its hierarchical and organic structure may be visible; that its exercise of the functions divinely entrusted to it, particularly of sacred power and of the administration of the

[79] Cf. *Lumen Gentium,* 22, CIC cc.336-337; CCEO cc. 49-50.

[80] *Lumen Gentium,* no. 8.

[81] CIC c. 204 § 2; CCEO c. 7 § 2.

> sacraments, is properly ordered; that the mutual relationships of Christ's faithful are reconciled in justice based on charity, with the rights of each safeguarded and defined; and lastly, that the common initiatives which are undertaken so that Christian life may be evermore perfectly carried out, are supported, strengthened, and promoted by canonical laws.[82]

Thus canon law, while attributing a primacy to love, grace and charisms, facilitates at the same time an orderly development in the life both of the ecclesiastical society and of the individual persons who belong to it.[83] In short, the Church needs social structures and canonical institutions; however, institutions are not the cause of the Church, but the means of her expression and actualization in this world as a society.

In the Church canonical institutions and organizational structures have reason for their existence, whether in the diocesan, patriarchal or universal level, as far as and only in so far as they help to effect the Church as a communion in the vertical and horizontal levels for the realization of its supreme end, namely the salvation of man and the glorification of God.

> In the Church this communion of men with God, in the 'love that never ends' is the purpose which governs everything in her that is a sacramental means, tied to this passing world. The [Church's] structure is totally ordered to the holiness of Christ's members".[84]

In the Preface to the CIC it is clearly stated that the purpose of canon law "is to be found in the care of souls in view of obtaining eternal salvation".[85] Pope John Paul II in the Apostolic Constitution *Pastor bonus* underscores the need of cooperation between the pastors of particular Churches and the pastor of the whole Church "so that all may bring their efforts together and strive to fulfill that supreme law which is the salvation of souls

---

[82] Pope JOHN PAUL II, Ap. Const. "Sacrae disciplinae leges", AAS 75 (1983) pars II, xii-xiii.

[83] Ap. Const. "Sacrae disciplinae leges", AAS 75 (1983) pars II, xi.

[84] *Catechism of the Catholic Church* , no.773.

[85] AAS 75 (1983) pars II, xx.

(*adimplere supremam eam legem, quae est salus animarum*)".[86] Again according to the mind of the pope the dicasteries of the Roman Curia "should approach all questions by a pastoral route and with a pastoral sense of judgment, aiming at justice and the good of the Church and above all at the salvation of souls (*salus animarum)*".[87] Therefore, organizational structures and canonical institutions are in service of communion, and their purpose is nothing but the realization of the supreme end of the Church, namely the *salus animarum* and the glorification of God.

Conclusion

Just as the people of God in the Old Testament originated from the covenant between God and Israel, the Church originated from the new covenant which Jesus established by the first celebration of the Eucharist during the Last Supper and ratified by his own death and resurrection. Therefore, the Church has a eucharistic origin. The same Paschal mystery of Christ, the same sacrifice of Christ on the cross, is made present in every eucharistic celebration and thus the Church is ever newly created.

The methodology of the formation of a local Church consists in the predication of the word and the celebration of the sacraments of initiation, namely baptism, confirmation and the Eucharist. This is the principle operative in the Church from the very day of Pentecost, and no other method is known to the Church for the formation of a Christian community. All those who receive the same sacraments of baptism and confirmation enter into an ontological communion with God and among themselves due to the action of the Holy Spirit who is the bond of communion. This communion is further nourished by the reception of the Eucharist.

---

[86] *Pastor Bonus*, AAS 80 (1988) 856.

[87] *Pastor Bonus*, AAS 80 (1988) 856; cf. also Art. 15, AAS 80 (1988) 863.

The most basic principle of the ecclesiology of Vatican II is that the Church is a communion or *koinonia*. According to the biblical patristic traditions, communion always involves two dimensions: the communion with God and the communion among the faithful. Such a communion cannot be effected by canonical institutions nor by bureaucratic administrative systems, but only by the celebration of liturgy, especially the Eucharist. In the Eucharist the faithful enter into direct communion with the triune God in a very special manner, and all those who share in the same body and blood of Christ become the body of Christ, namely the Church. In short, the Church originated from the perfect liturgy of Christ on the cross; the Church continues in being through the celebration of the liturgy of the word and the liturgy of the sacraments, and the Church reaches its perfection through the celebration of liturgy. Therefore, liturgy makes the Church.

CHURCH AS TRADITION

Joseph Powathil

The modern age is often marked by man's insatiable desire to make a full fledged flight towards the future. Modern man tends to raise his eye-brows when he hears the word "tradition". This is largely because tradition is regarded as a collection of dead things of the past. It is seen as something which binds people to the past, and is therefore misunderstood and seen as something opposed to an orientation towards the future. Some even consider tradition as something contrary to an emancipated rationality.[1] This, I think, is a wrong notion of 'tradition', since it is here being confused with 'traditionalism'.

There are philosophies today that would give full authority to reason to fashion man according to its own designs. They seem to have failed to understand man or they have only partially understood him.[2] One has to remember the basic truth about man: that he is a creature and cannot declare his independence over against his creator. Religion cannot faithfully and fruitfully develop without the community of those who had previously experienced the reality of God, just as science cannot develop without a learning that had gone before and which accepted the break-through of reason. Tradition and reason are not opposed, rather they go hand in hand. A believer cannot hold that man is merely a product of evolution or a commodity of pure reason but has to see him as one who in his very being proceeds from and is orientated to God.

---

[1] Cf. also J. RATZINGER, *Principles of Catholic Theology: Building Stones for a Fundamental Theology*, San Francisco 1987, pp. 85-87.

[2] J. POWATHIL, *Sabha Samoohathil [Church in the World]*, ed. J. Kochuparampil, Changanacherry 1994, p. 209.

1. What is Tradition?

The word 'tradition' denotes basically a 'handing over' or 'transmission' of something. This handing over refers to the reality that is passed on, having an implication also as to the process of transmission. Christian tradition, for example, has its uniqueness in the person of Jesus Christ, God's Word made Flesh.

> God graciously arranged that the things he had once revealed for the salvation of all peoples should remain in their entirety, throughout the ages, and be transmitted to all generations. Therefore, Christ the Lord, in whom the entire Revelation of the most high God is summed up (cf. 2 Cor. 1:20; 3:16-4:6) commanded the apostles to preach the Gospel...(DV 7)

Hence the apostolic Christ-experience that is handed on constitutes Christian Tradition. It forms the very matrix in which a Christian is to be shaped. Hence tradition, for a Christian, is a reality of receiving, living and communicating.[3] In this sense, tradition has triple dimension of past, present and future.

Ecclesial Tradition is the communication of faith of the apostolic Church to the present generation with a future orientation. In the words of Y. Congar

> Tradition is certainly a continuity through time that flows past, but it is an *historical* continuity: it is the permanence of the past in the present, from the heart of which it prepares the future.[4]

Tradition is an extension of franchise, that is, the past generations have a voting right in the present in view of the future. In short, tradition is communication as well as communion in the Spirit between generations of disciples of Christ.

Humanity without tradition would be like a building without foundations. Humanity and history are intimately connected, and it is memory which unites and fashions history

---

[3] See also, J.M.R.TILLARD, *Church of Churches:the Ecclesiology of Communion,* Collegeville 1992, p. 119.

[4] Y. CONGAR, *Tradition and the Life of the Church,* London 1964, p. 107.

by generating tradition. The distinctive feature of tradition is in fact the ability to recognize our "now" as significant also for the "tomorrow" of those who come after us. Therefore, we are morally obliged to the coming generation to transmit or hand over to them what has been received, organically developed and lived today. The past can be discovered as something to be preserved only if the future is regarded as a duty. It is the discovery of the indivisibility of the past and present which makes tradition.[5]

The Church as the spouse of Christ is true to her identity only when she preserves and passes on what is entrusted with her by the Lord. She is the custodian of the sacred tradition of the Apostles. Church as tradition has its central moment in salvation history; the Father, out of His universal will for salvation, handed over His only Begotten Son (Jn 3:16). Jesus Christ handed over himself through the paschal mystery; finally, he handed over the Holy Spirit at the Pentecost to the Church (LG 2-4). The Church is constituted out of this three-fold 'handing-over'. In that sense, Church is the privileged *locus* of tradition. This memory (*anamnesis*) of the salvific handing over of Christ in the Church is her tradition today.

2. Concept of Memory

Memory, in general, is the intersection of past and present at one point. It is a genuine understanding and celebration of the past, in the present context in view of the future. A person who loses his memory is a fossil of the past, and a community which has no collective memory is no community. We should say memory is a divine gift. Memory becomes a synonym for life, since it recapitulates life in its various phases and gives us the possibility of shaping a future.[6] It gives meaning to the "now" by establishing a unity, by

---

[5] J. RATZINGER, *Principles of Catholic Theology*, p. 87.

[6] E.G. FARRUGIA, "Within Living Memory: Tradition, the Shape of the Future", in *Catholic Eastern Churches: Heritage and Identity*, ed. P. Pallath, Rome 1994, p. 212.

communicating the past to the present and providing a mode of access to the future.

Memory creates tradition through its transtemporality, by its ability to go beyond "today" into "yesterday" and "tomorrow".[7] Usually, in our common language, we limit memory to a remembering of the past in the present. But memory in its pure sense presupposes a faithful understanding and preservation of the past in the light of the present experiences facilitating a safe advance into the future. We are not to forget that memory has a definite reference to the future; we cannot freeze memory in the 'eternity' of the now and the 'now' of the memory reveals that it is future-related. This constitutes the organicity of memory and that of tradition.

3. Christ as Memory (*Anamnesis*) of the Church

We have seen elsewhere that Christian tradition is the memory of Christ which is active in the Spirit within the Church. Jesus becomes memory, for us, primarily as the sacrament of the Triune God. It is Jesus who reveals God as a relationship, a relationship of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. It is he who reveals to us the Father's love: "God so loved the world that he gave his only Son" (Jn 3:16). It is in Jesus that we experience the concrete, decisive and irrevocable love and concern of God for humanity. Jesus as the Word incarnate (Jn 1:14), has communicated the love of the Father and has promised that he will come to take us to the Father (Jn 14:2-3), thereby not fixing us in our "yesterday" (old self) but giving us a "today" and "tomorrow" (in him we become a new creation). In short, Jesus through the Spirit united our "yesterday" and "tomorrow" in the present. He also opened up, for us, the possibility of sharing in the life of the Triune God. We see the Father in Jesus. It is through Jesus that the Father comes to us and that we go to the Father.[8] "I am the way, truth and life. No one comes to the

---

[7] J. RATZINGER, *Principles of Catholic Theology*, p. 88.

[8] J. POWATHIL, *Jeevitham Mathrusabhayodothu [To Live is to Live with the Mother Church]*, ed. J.Muthanattu, Kottayam 1988, p. 24.

Father, but by me" (Jn 14:6). Our understanding of God's sharing his life with humanity in Jesus has a past, present and future. It begins in creation, continues in the history of salvation, intensifies in incarnation, matures in the Church and consummates in *parousia* and beatific vision. Jesus is God's reign and God's self communicating love in person. Jesus as memory is "Emmanuel" - "God with us" - until the end of ages.

Jesus' intimate relationship with the Father is expressed in the term "Son". Jesus is the Son who is obedient to the will of the Father unto death (Phil 2:8), an obedience pleasing to the Father, accepted and glorified in his resurrection. The Scripture bears ample testimony to Jesus' intimate relationship with the Father. The Son as the "image of the invisible God" (Col 1:15) came "not to do my own will but the will of him who sent me" (Jn 6:38); "I and the Father are one" (Jn 10:30); "He who has seen me has seen the Father" (Jn 14:9). This intimate relationship with the Father was at the core of his person and mission. We perceive Jesus' sonship from his obedience which even reflected in his social consciousness. As a Jew he lived in the community of Israel obeying and placing himself in the tradition of Moses and prophets thereby giving a radical and fundamental interpretation of the will of God.[9]

The sonship of Christ is the basis of our own sonship: "The Holy Spirit bears witness to our sonship as we cry "Abba! Father!" (Rom 8:16). The person of Jesus Christ becomes the deciding factor of our sonship. He is the one who reveals and makes present the Father in the "here and now"; he is the one who acquired for us the sonship. So he becomes the pivot around which our Christian existence rotates. As the Council succinctly puts it, Jesus is the one "in whom the entire revelation of the most high God is summed up" (DV 7). Church celebrates this eternal salvific truth, which is the central theme of her worship, in her liturgy. Hence the person of Jesus and his paschal mysteries become the essence of the memory of the Church.

---

[9] J. RATZINGER, *Principles of Catholic Theology*, p. 96.

4. Church as the Memory of Christ

The content of revelation is a communion between God and man established in Jesus through the Holy Spirit. This God-man communion is essentially communitarian (Acts 2:44-47; 4:32-35). The communion between God and man, and between human beings gives shape to the Church. She is the sacred tradition or sacramental continuity of this communion.[10] In other words, the communion between God and man is transmitted to the community of believers who constitute the Church. She becomes the memory of Christ precisely as the sacrament of Christ while Christ becomes her memory primarily as the sacrament of the Triune God. She, as the memory of Christ, is the *anamnesis* of the marvellous deeds, God did in the person of Jesus Christ.

Tradition presupposes a *locus*, a bearer, a proper subject that preserves and communicates it. Church, as the sacramental continuity of Christ, is the *locus* privileged for his tradition or memory. J. Ratzinger explains the role of Church as that which rests upon the oneness of the historical context and the communal character of the basic experience that constitute tradition.[11] There is no question of the fullness of the tradition of Christ outside the Church or no one can have a full participation in the memory of Christ without the Church.

The memory of Christ constitutes her very being and so this memory is basically ecclesial. All other memories are private memories. We cannot, precisely for this reason, fabricate a Christianity out of pure reason: a "test tube" Christianity or a Christianity embracing all the lofty ideals found in all religions as the Indian emperor Ashoka did. The believing community becomes the bearer of an ecclesial tradition. The inner principle of transmission of tradition is the Holy Spirit who animates the Church. It is the Spirit who constantly instigates us to refer back

---

[10] J. MEYENDORFF, *Living Tradition,* New York 1978, p. 16.

[11] J. RATZINGER, *Principles of Catholic Theology,* p. 100.

to the original deposit, which is the norm and the yardstick of our life today.

The Apostles are the authentic witnesses of the person of Jesus Christ. The content of their *kerygma* is the person of Jesus Christ or the memory of his person that they personally witnessed (1 Jn.1:1-3). The Church as the community of those who have received the Christ-event through the witness of the apostles can have no other foundation other than that of "the apostles and prophets" (Eph 2:20). Therefore, their witness is the foundation of the tradition of the Church. This truth is the basis and guarantee of the apostolicity of the Church. Hence our authenticity of faith can be verified only with reference to the faith of the early community. Hence Church, as the guarantee and guardian of apostolicity, has the prime and God-given duty to guard and foster the orthodoxy and orthopraxy in the light of her apostolic tradition.

Church, in her very existence, is called to be a worshipping community. She is called to render praise and thanks for the *mirabilia Dei* that is culminated in the paschal mystery of Christ (SC 5-7). She becomes the *locus* where the act of thanksgiving is perfectly realized. Moreover, she has the mandate "Do this in memory of me" from the Eternal Priest. Hence she joins to the risen Lord through the power of the Holy Spirit in the perennial and celestial celebration where she becomes one with Christ who is the offerer and the victim.

5. Eucharist as Memorial Celebration

The eucharistic celebration makes the Church. It is here that she becomes one body in union with her own Head, the risen Lord (1 Cor 10:17). It is here that we see revealed the communitarian nature of the Church; Christ the head and Church the mystical body are concretely manifested in the worship; the heavenly and the earthly ones are united to render *eucharistia*; past, present and future become one present. In short, the Eucharist makes the Church where the Spirit of the risen Lord fashions the Church into the body of Christ.

The eucharistic nature of the Church is possible only through the power of the Holy Spirit. He activates the community for worship "in spirit and truth" (Jn 4:20). He inculcates in the worshipping community the sentiments of thanksgiving for the ineffable gifts. He unites the worshipping community with its head, the risen Lord and between the members of the community. All the believers are brought together into a unity by virtue of the reconciliation effected in the eucharistic celebration. Church makes the Eucharist in the sense that it is the celebrating community which in obedience to the Lord's command comes together in the Spirit to celebrate the memorial of the New Covenant.[12] In short, it is in the celebration of the Eucharist that the faithful share in a pre-eminent way in the apostolic experience of Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit.

6. *Lex orandi-Lex credendi-Lex vivendi*

We have seen above that tradition is the sum total of the memory of God's saving act and it takes a concrete shape in the Church. She, being essentially communitarian, witnesses tradition in different ways. These pluralistic approaches confirm also the inexhaustible treasure of divine tradition. The pilgrim Church as the memory of Christ travels through all ages carrying "the mark of this world which will pass, and she herself takes her place among the creatures which groan and travail" (LG 48), yet never ceasing to be the source of faith. Thus Church experiences and manifests her tradition in her prayer (*Lex orandi*), faith (*Lex credendi*) and in her particular life-style (*Lex vivendi*). These expressions together constitute her identity or ecclesial individuality (UR 15-17). They are inter-related and they complement each other.

Church, out of her call to be the worshipping community, reveals her identity mainly through her liturgical worship. Liturgy is understood to be the official, public worship of the Church. As the Council points out: "The liturgy is the

---

[12] B. FORTE, *The Church: Icon of the Trinity,* Boston 1991, p. 71.

summit toward which the activity of the Church is directed; it is also the fount from which all her power flows" (SC 10). It is the celebration of the divine economy through signs and symbols in the sacred time (SC 5-7).

The conciliar understanding of Sacred Liturgy highlights many points. Church as the worshipping community inherits a tradition which springs from her memory of the divine economy and she celebrates this tradition through her liturgy. Here one may recall the inevitable relation between "rule of prayer and rule of faith" (*lex orandi, lex credendi*). Y. Congar explains it as follows:

> The Church has invested the whole of its faith in its prayer, and though fervour does not create truth, yet the liturgy contains, offers, and expresses in its own way all the mysteries, only certain aspects of which have been formulated by our theological understanding and in dogmas.[13]

The Church celebrates her divine tradition through signs and symbols. Thus the divine receives a human touch. This can be analogically explained as a form of 'incarnation' that we encounter in the liturgical celebration.

This process of 'incarnation' of Tradition is seen in the development of various local liturgies. One and the same salvific plan encountered various people and cultures; many Fathers and contemplatives contributed to the development of local liturgies. We have, thus, various liturgies and liturgical families, and these diverse liturgies are different forms of celebration of the same Tradition or memory in a particular ecclesial community. Different Churches were distinctively different spiritual communities within the fold of the Catholic Communion[14]. This gave shape to particular form of liturgy, theology, spirituality

---

[13] Y. CONGAR, *Tradition and Traditions,* London 1966, p. 335.

[14] J. POWATHIL, "The Missionary Role of the Syro-Malabar Church", in *Mission in India Today, The Task of St Thomas Christians*, ed. K. Pathil, Bangalore 1988, pp. 1-13, esp. 1-5.

and discipline in an individual Church.[15] Hence various ecclesial traditions become the common patrimony of the Universal Church. If we fail to understand the ecclesiological implications of a particular liturgical patrimony, we may do harm to our own tradition and naturally to the Church universal. This may even lead to branding those who try to be authentic in their own divine tradition as "narrow-minded" or "extremists" or even "fundamentalists".

Tradition manifests itself in the form of the faith of the Church i.e. tradition become *lex credendi*. Faith, in this sense, can be easily understood as the natural (spontaneous) response to the salvific call of the risen Lord encountered in the living memory of the particular Church. As tradition is the source of the ecclesial reality, so also faith is basically ecclesial. A new member is received into the life of the community through baptism. One enters into the community of faith and inherits its faith through baptism. The ecclesial dimension of faith becomes more clear if one considers the early practice of catechumenate where one receives faith through a long period of formation. It is not an individual initiative, rather at the right time the individual is accepted by the community of faithful. In other words, faith comes from the Church and leads back to the Church.[16]

The communitarian dimension of faith becomes more evident in the faith experience of the apostles themselves. J. Meyendorff tries to present it in the following way. The Apostles truly understood Jesus' person and mission only after his resurrection and upon the descent of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, hence only in the community of fellowship in the Spirit (Jn 16:13).[17] Man does not receive faith when he remains

---

[15] For details, J. POWATHIL, "Syro-Malabar Sabhayude Vekthithwam Aradhanayil" (Individualaity of the Syro-Malabar Church and Liturgy) Mar Thoma Vidya Niketan 1 (1993), pp. 12-25.

[16] Cf. also J. POWATHIL, "The Missionary Role of the Syro-Malabar Church", pp. 6-7.

[17] J. MEYENDORFF, *Living Tradition,* p. 17.

as an isolated "I"; he receives it from the community of those who have believed before him and tell him of God as an accepted reality of their history. In short, today we have access to Jesus only through the faith of the community.[18]

The communitarian aspect of faith implies also the ecclesiality of faith formation. Church has to form its members in all levels to encounter and experience the Risen Lord. She has to be the model and inspiration for them to be witnesses to the tradition that one has received from the Church. This also will encourage her members to examine their faith and to conform it with the faith of the Church. Hence Church as the sacramental continuity and authentic custodian of the tradition has the prime concern to teach, to profess and to witness to the apostolic faith[19].

Faith formation, in all levels, calls for a deep contemplation and profound study of the proper tradition. This becomes the prime duty of the theologians. However, they are called to illuminate other members of the Church in the divine tradition. This demands a feeling of being one with his own ecclesial tradition and living the same. Here theology becomes the result of contemplation and study in the context of one's ecclesial life and not simply a desk-work. Such a growth of pluralistic theology keeps tradition more authentic and Catholic.

7. Church as Communion of Churches

Church, as we have seen above, is the concretization of the memory of God's salvific plan which we call tradition. Church which has its origin, structure and destiny in the Trinitarian God is a unity in diversity of different apostolic traditions, a communion of communions, a Church of

---

[18] J. POWATHIL, "Iso ente Karthavum Deivavum" [Jesus: my Lord and my God], *Mathavum Chinthayum* 67 (1987), p. 92.

[19] Cf. J.POWATHIL, "Ecclesial Formation", in *Ecclesial Identity of the Thomas Christians*, ed. T. Vallilamthadam et. al. OIRSI 87, Kottayam 1985, pp. 17-31.

Churches.[20] The conciliar Decree on the Catholic Eastern Churches emphasizes this aspect of communion of various traditions. These traditions are apostolic and they have given form to different rites. These rites resulted in various individual Churches. They all have the same faith, same sacraments and same government. They are thus organically united and together form the holy Catholic Church which is the Mystical Body of Christ (OE 2). This unity in diversity manifests the universality of the Church. Hence the universal Church is the communion of various individual Churches and she has no concrete existence outside them.[21] The *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches* speaks in clear terms about the preservation of rites:

> The rites of the Eastern Churches, as the patrimony of the entire Church of Christ, in which there is clearly evident the tradition which has come from the Apostles through the Fathers and which affirm the divine unity in diversity of the Catholic faith, are to be religiously preserved and fostered (Can. 39).

The communion of Churches is realized in charity and it is the best example of fellowship of the Holy Spirit in her members. P. Duprey would present the communion in three levels: spiritual, visible and juridical.[22]

Tradition can be outlined as the verification of the apostolic Christ experience in a people, taking specific form of life, spiritual heritage, worship, liturgy, theology and ecclesiastical discipline, integrated into the socio-cultural milieu

---

[20] J. KALLARANGATT, "Communion Ecclesiology", in *Communion of Churches,* ed. X. Koodapuzha, OIRSI 160, Kottayam 1993, pp. 72-95, esp. 85-89.

[21] For details, M. VELLANICKAL, "Biblical Theology of the Individual Churches", *Christian Orient* 1 (1980), pp. 5-19; T. KOONAMMAKKAL, "An Ecclesiology in the Syriac Tradition", in *Communion of Churches,* ed. X. Koodapuzha, OIRSI 160, Kottayam 1993, pp. 129-142.

[22] P. DUPREY, "A Catholic Perspective on Ecclesial Communion" *Christian Orient* 9 (1988), pp. 11-21, esp. 20-21.

of that people.[23] Hence at the heart of tradition lies the apostolic Christ-experience which is received into the socio-cultural milieu of a people which gives rise to a certain way of life expressed in their liturgy, spirituality, theology and discipline. Just as the different Christ-experiences of the evangelists led to the rise of four Gospels, so too the different apostolic Christ-experiences received into the diverse and particular socio-cultural milieus of peoples, led to different apostolic traditions. In the early Church one can detect various apostolic traditions such as Matthean, Petrine, Johannine and Pauline heritages.[24] The universal Church is a communion of these different apostolic traditions having the same faith, sacraments and hierarchy. Therefore, the concept of the Church is basically that of communion of Churches having various apostolic heritages. Though the elements of communion are same in all Churches, the concrete expression of these elements differ according to different individual traditions. That is to say, though faith is the same in all the Churches, the expression of faith in liturgy, theology spirituality and discipline (UR 15-17) takes different forms.

The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church convincingly teaches the individuality and the organic unity of various Churches:

> It has come out through divine providence that, in course of time, different Churches set up in various places by the apostles and their successors joined together in a multiplicity of organically united groups which, whilst safeguarding the unity of the faith and the unique divine structure of the universal Church, have their own discipline, enjoy their own liturgical usage and inherit a theological and spiritual patrimony ... this multiplicity of local Churches, unified in a common

---

[23] M. VELLANICKAL, "Biblical Theology of the Individual Churches", p. 8.

[24] For a detailed expose of the different faith traditions in the New Testament, see R.E. BROWN, *The Church the Apostles Left Behind,* New York 1984; R. SCHNACKENBURG, *The Church in the New Testament,* London 1965, pp. 55-103.

> effort, shows all the more resplendently the catholicity of the undivided Church (LG 23).

The individual Churches differ among themselves; they are not called to be carbon copies. Moreover, their separate existence and government is a call to be the authentic custodians of the apostolic tradition they have inherited. The other Churches must be able to respect and appreciate their distinctive mark of *lex orandi, lex credendi* and *lex vivendi* (OE 3, 6). A person's fidelity to his own heritage is his fidelity to the Church universal. The Orientals are instructed to have greater knowledge and more exact use of their own traditions and are exhorted to return to their authentic tradition (OE 6).[25] The *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches* binds the hierarchs, clerics and members of institutes of consecrated life and other Christian faithful by the obligation of accurate observance of their own rite (Can. 40 §§ 1-3).

The basic difference between various individual Churches may be traced back to the difference in their apostolic tradition, nourished under a particular hierarchy.[26] Cultural factors and circumstances of history (cf. CCEO c. 28) may have accentuated some of these differences. But the individuality and identity of a particular tradition is based primarily on the distinctive spiritual heritage and faith tradition[27]. This is the area where the Syro-Malabar Church has to reconsider her present situation. The observation of G. Panicker points to this reality:

> The strength and dynamism which can come from the riches and vigor of their spiritual and liturgical traditions do not exist at present. They have for the most part lost sight of their liturgical and spiritual heritage which have been supplanted by the latin liturgical customs and "popular devotions". The Syro-Malabar Church as it exists at present is not an

---

[25] See also J. POWATHIL, "The Missionary Role of the Syro-Malabar Church", pp. 2-7.

[26] Cf. CCEO c. 27; also M. VELLANICKAL, "Biblical Theology of the Individual Churches", pp. 15-16.

[27] J. POWATHIL, "Ecclesial Formation", pp. 21-24.

authentic oriental Church, but a second-rate supplementary Latin Church[28].

It is high time for the Syro-Malabar Church to examine their role and responsibility to the Catholic communion. Their Catholic identity should enable them to be the legitimate heir of their apostolic heritage. Their present ecclesial life should be a living example of catholicity.[29]

Conclusion

We have been trying to discover some of the ecclesiological implications of tradition. It is the sum total of the memory of God's universal salvific plan. The Church is the concretization of this tradition and the sacramental continuity of the memory of God's great deeds. The Church expresses and experiences this memory through her liturgy, faith and particular life style. The communion of these various traditions form the holy Catholic Church. Hence the Church can be understood as the communion of various apostolic traditions.

Tradition is sacred as well as salvific. Hence the individual Churches as custodians of a particular form of apostolic tradition are called to be authentic witnesses to their own apostolic heritage and catholicity of the Church universal. It is in this background one has to see the importance of ecclesial reform in an apostolic Church like that of the Syro-Malabar. There can be reform true and false. Only a reform that is effected in an organic manner can be true and lasting. This would require faithfulness to the earliest sources of the tradition, and also to its specificity in the present. The Syro-Malabar Church must follow the path of organic renewal envisaged by the

---

[28] G. PANICKER, "An Analysis of the Present Ecclesial Situation in India", in *Ecclesial Identity of the Thomas Christians,* ed. T. Vellilamthadam, OIRSI 87 (Kottayam, 1985), p. 146.

[29] See also X. KOODAPUZHA, "Ecclesial Perspective and the Particular Laws of the Syro-Malabar Church", *Christian Orient* 13 (1992), pp. 7-10.

Council and as demanded by the ecumenical situations. In this way the Church of Christ will be manifested in a more perfect manner (OE 5-6).

LIFE OF OUR LIFE:
Understanding the Liturgy

Dom Cuthbert Johnson OSB

If we wish to understand more fully and to enter ever more deeply into the mystery of the Church, we must deepen our understanding of the liturgy which the Church celebrates, and in which she proclaims her faith in God and his saving mercy made manifest in Christ Jesus.

The liturgy can be described as the language of the Church, it is the living voice of Tradition and the authentic expression of her faith. The Holy Spirit who spoke through the prophets and inspired the Holy Scriptures, speaks to us today in the celebration of the liturgy. The presence of the Holy Spirit and the power of his action allows us to speak and recognise the doctrinal character of the liturgy and see in it one of the principal sources of Tradition.

The liturgy has always been a source to which the Church and the Fathers of the Church have had recourse to seek clarification in matters of doctrine. The liturgy is the principal instrument of God's on-going self-revelation to each person in every generation. There is to be no new revelation, but what has been revealed is made present in mystery in the actual celebration of the liturgy, for the life of the people of God.

1. Understanding the Liturgy

A true understanding of the liturgy can only come through the study of, and meditation upon, the texts of the liturgy. The task of the liturgist, like that of the scriptural exegete, is to explain the letter of the text in order to reveal its spirit. On the eve of the Second Vatican Council and in its immediate aftermath, numerous studies began to appear on the prayers of the Roman Missal. Attempts were made to determine

their origin and authorship, and illustrate their theological and spiritual significance.

The prayers after communion contain a varied, rich and fine expression of eucharistic theology. In those prayers can be found indications of the eschatological character of the eucharist, of the eucharist as the forgiveness of sin, source and sustainment of unity. So many aspects of ecclesiology which need to be examined and deepened. The texts of the Pontifical and the Ritual similarly provide an inexhaustible source for reflection. The liturgy and rite for the dedication of a church reflect a rich theology of the Church as a sign of the saving presence of God's mercy in the world and redemption brought and achieved in and through Jesus Christ. Christian hope and belief in eternal life and the resurrection of the body is nowhere better expressed than in the Rite of Christian burial.

It should be remembered that the teaching given in the liturgy, its prayers, actions and symbols, is often more readily assimilated by the faithful than many an explanation or course of study can achieve. We should approach the liturgical books as if they were the Church's theological manuals. Now that the liturgy is in the language of the local Church it is easy for both priests and people to take into their hands and meditate and reflect upon the texts of Divine Worship.

2. Liturgical Discipline

Liturgical unity is not simply a matter of discipline: the principle of liturgical unity is founded upon and in conformity with the nature of dogma and the constitution of the Church. Christ founded his Church to unite all the children of God, and sent the Holy Spirit to sanctify and make them one. This is the basis of respect for liturgical law, and the reason why no individual has the right to change the prayer of the Church on private initiative. The observance of liturgical law does not exclude there being a measure of adaptation and creativity in the celebration of the liturgy. Our first task is to understand and absorb, to experience and live out, the mystery of Christ as put before us by the Church in the liturgy.

Familiarity with the prayers that the Church puts before us is the best preparation and formation for composing new prayers, for composing the intentions in the "Prayer of the Faithful" and on other occasions when allowed by the liturgical norms.

Genuine creativity can only be achieved by those who are imbued with a sense of Tradition and who are willing and able to enter into the mind of the Church and the whole sacramental economy. Repeatedly during the years when the Second Vatican Council's directives concerning liturgical renewal were being implemented, great emphasis was laid upon the need for catechesis. It is generally accepted that sufficient catechesis was not always given. The people were told what had to be done, but far too often no adequate explanation was given as to why changes had to be made. In 1985 an Extra-ordinary Synod of Bishops was held in Rome on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the conclusion of the Second Vatican Council. In the opening speech of the Synod his Eminence Cardinal Godfried Danneels stated that "despite the repeated call for sound catechesis it has sometimes happened that insufficient preparation has been given for renewal. This has involved the risk that changes remain at a somewhat superficial level. A certain subjectivism has appeared in some areas where it has been forgotten that the liturgy is the prayer and the patrimony of the whole Church".

It can be said that thirty years after the close of the Council the need for adequate catechesis remains, and it is an urgent one. It is obvious that catechesis is always to be given, that it is a need for every generation. The tragic paradox today is that whereas there has been more talk about catechesis than perhaps ever before, there is today in some areas a lack of knowledge of the most fundamental aspects of the faith and this is a matter of serious concern.

3. Liturgical Renewal

Even though there have been problems and difficulties, it would be quite incorrect not to recognise the immense benefits

and graces that have come to the Church from the liturgical renewal, as the above mentioned Cardinal Godfried Danneels noted "it is generally felt that the programme of liturgical renewal initiated by the Second Vatican Council has been accepted. It is evident that the Council's wish for a more active participation on the part of the faithful has been fulfilled. The sacramental life of the Church is being lived with greater intensity. The "warm and living love for scripture" which the Council was eager to promote (*Sacrosanctum Concilium* n. 24) has already been inculcated and is bearing fruit: "The richness of the Word of God, especially in the Scriptures, has penetrated the consciousness of the faithful". The Cardinal went on to assert that it would be a fundamental error of logic to conclude that because certain negative or unfortunate things happened after the Council, their cause was to be found in the Council itself: "post Concilium ergo propter Concilium": that because they happened after the Council, they happened because of the Council. Despite the fact that there remains much to be done, there is a spirit of confidence and a deep trust in the ever present guidance of the Holy Spirit. Patience and understanding are called for in order to move forward effectively. The Church's response, stated Cardinal Danneels, "must not be reduced to disciplinary and administrative measures. Post-Conciliar deficiencies cannot be dealt with by using pre-conciliar measures".

4. Point of Departure

Reflection upon the meaning of the liturgy and upon our experience of it must begin with an examination of our faith. This is not a matter of our intellectual approach to the faith, but to the faith as a lived reality. It is the quality of our faith that we bring to the liturgy which is of primary importance. It may well be that many of the problems related to the liturgy are not liturgical, but stem from the fact that the faith of those celebrating the liturgy is not adequate to the task that they have to perform. This is a delicate matter, but so is anything related to

growth in holiness. There should be no dichotomy between liturgy and life: liturgy is life of our life.

5. Liturgy and Life

Often, the explanations or descriptions of the liturgy which are given by liturgists or those who make commentaries on the liturgy, while being often very fine in themselves, fall short of the actual celebration. As a result the complaint is sometimes made that the claims made for the liturgy in theory do not correspond to what is actually experienced in practice. For example, any amount of adequate catechesis and preparation for the celebration of the paschal mystery can be rendered totally ineffective by poor quality liturgical celebrations during the *Triduo Sacro*. For example, poor chants, badly read readings, insignifcant use of symbols - a plastic or small paschal candle - all these inadequacies diminish the potential effectiveness of the liturgy.

All of our life must be brought and laid before the Lord in prayer. During the course of liturgical celebrations (Morning and Evening Prayer, Eucharist, various Rituals including Blessings) there are defined moments for prayer of petition and intercession. Although after the celebration of the Divine mysteries the Christian should be renewed in the spirit in order to go forth and love and serve the Lord in spirit and in truth, it should also be remembered that the liturgy is not exactly the moment or place for an individual to work out personal problems. There must be moments for prayer apart, in which we follow the example of the Lord, who before every important decision or moment in his public life - so we read in the gospel - went apart to pray to his Father. The liturgy is always the celebration of God's saving work in Christ and the actualization of his saving mysteries for the life of the people of God. The liturgy is a relationship of listening and response, and this disposition must be reflected in the christian's daily life. The liturgy is not the place to seek a moment's solitude from the exigencies of daily living; that need is met by prayer apart in silence and recollection. The contemplative dimension of our

christian experience has to be developed by personal prayer, by spiritual reading, meditation and silence. This growth in holiness, however, will be nourished by an active and fruitful participation in the liturgy. This is evident in the very life of the Church in the monastic Orders. The monastic day with its silence and work is punctuated by the regular call to the celebration in common of the Liturgy of the Hours.

The liturgy should and will help the individual to cope with the stresses and problems of daily life, not forgetting the opportunity of giving thanks for the good things in life. There should be no problem in the sphere of the relationship between prayer apart and prayer in common. It is however, an unfortunate fact that there are many who still regard attendance at the liturgy as their private affair: the people of God still need to be reminded and taught about prayer, its individual and corporate aspect. When there is a balanced life of prayer, demands will not be made upon the liturgy which it is not designed to meet.

Certain sincere and well intentioned efforts to make a liturgical celebration more effective or meaningful often only bring about momentary success. It is always difficult to determine what constitutes a successful liturgy. The fathers of the desert used to say that when a monk leaves the assembly saying I have prayed well today or is satisfied with his prayer then he may not have prayed at all. It is therefore with great circumspection that an analysis be made about liturgical experiences, especially when looking for a ready made solution to problems. We should learn from the experience of the apostle Saint Peter on the mount of the Transfiguration, "Lord, it is good for us to be here, let us build three tents....." He was so uplifted, carried out of himself by that wonderful experience of the Transfigured Lord that he wanted hold on to that moment, to make it last for ever. Like the apostles, of whom the gospel says so simply that looking up they saw "Jesus only", we have to learn to see Jesus in the familiar everyday happenings of our lives and this includes our liturgical life.

6. Liturgy and Faith

The Church has renewed the liturgy in order to throw into greater relief the truth that she has to proclaim, since although the deposit of Revelation is unchangeable, its expression is subject to change - the unalterable text being that of Sacred Scripture. No one generation has a monopoly on the expression of the faith, but every generation is obliged to receive what has been handed on and transmit it in a way which is comprehensible. In this respect it is a duty to work towards right adaptation of the liturgy and the requisite cultural diversity regarding its expression.

Praise and thanksgiving are among the elements which make up the principal forms of the liturgy. The proclamation which the Church makes of the mysteries of faith in the liturgy, the confession of the great works of God, is rooted in the Scriptures especially the Psalms and poetical writings. Every liturgical celebration and the whole ensemble of the Liturgical Year is a confession of the truth which God has revealed to the Church through Jesus Christ. It is because of this reality that the texts of the liturgy embody the inviolable rule of faith and that the axiom *Legem credendi statuat lex supplicandi* has its origin and meaning.

True prayer is directly related to the confession of God's glorious work of Salvation. In prayer the Church expresses her love because she knows that she is loved. Prayer is not only the expression of the Church's faith but also of her hope, of her confidence that God will bring to perfection the work that He has begun.

The prayer of the Church should be seen in relationship to the exercise of the theological virtues, the highest activity of which a human being is capable of exercising through the grace of God.

The knowledge that God has worked great wonders for her, makes the Church want to sing out the praises of God, to tell His wonderful deeds. The Blessed Virgin Mary is the image of

the Church in this respect, and her Canticle, the *Magnificat* is an epitome of the Church's life of praise.

The liturgical rites have as their end the glorification of God and the sanctification of mankind and the world. A liturgical celebration is an action which has both a passive as well as an active aspect. A liturgical celebration is an action which actualizes the mystery which is being celebrated. It must never be forgotten that the liturgy is the worship offered to God by Christ as Head of the Church, in and through His members; through the celebration of the liturgy a mystery is made present for the life of the people of God and that in and through the liturgy the Church manifests and expresses her true nature.

7. The Trinitarian Dimension of the Liturgy

The principle of true worship is only to be found in God, in the very mystery of the Holy Trinity and the inner relationships of the divine life. This divine life was given visible expression by the Incarnation of the Word of God, as Prosper Guèranger poetically expressed this:

> The Liturgy is something so excellent, that to find its principle it is necessary to seek it in God; because God, in the contemplation of his infinite perfections, praises and glorifies Himself ceaselessly, as He loves Himself with an eternal love. However these diverse acts accomplished in the divine essence, did not have a visible and truly liturgical character until the moment when one of the three Persons took human nature, and from that moment the duties of religion were rendered to the glorious Trinity.

The life of Christ on earth was in a certain sense like a great liturgical act. It was at the Last Supper that Christ brought to completion the whole of tradition of worship by the institution of the Eucharist, the great liturgical action, the great mystery. Jesus Christ, Priest and victim, is our Mediator before the throne of his Father and before leaving this world he sent out his apostles to proclaim the good news of Salvation of which the liturgy was to be the life giving instrument.

The symbols, chants and actions which make up part of the liturgy have to be understood in the light of the mystery of the Incarnation. It is through the mystery of the Incarnation that signs and symbols in christian worship belong to a completely new realm. As the Preface for Christmas states, "through the contemplations of things visible we are caught up into the contemplation of things invisible". Through the mystery of the Incarnation God communicated definitively in a visible way with his creation.

8. The Social Dimension of the Liturgy

While emphasis is needed today on the doctrinal character of the liturgy it is important not to forget the horizontal dimension or the social aspect of liturgical prayer. The liturgy is not just prayer but prayer considered as a social action. The social or communal dimension of the liturgy is the basis of divine worship.

Clearly individual prayer, that is prayer apart, cannot be considered to be liturgical. Those, however, who have need of help in their prayer should be encouraged to use texts from the liturgy, not only because of their inherent quality but also because it is a means of uniting the individual to the prayer of the Church.

The Church is a society made up of men and women and not of spirits, consequently its very nature demands that it should manifest itself by means of signs and symbols. The liturgy is the supreme expression of the life of the Church whose mission is to worship God in spirit and in truth and to be a sign of God's saving mercy.

The social dimension of the liturgy is not just a passive characteristic but demands a degree of active participation by all members of the community. The deepest level of participation is not on the mere physical level but at the level of catechesis and formation.

Everyone is duty bound to worship God, an action which is the exercise of the virtue of religion. The Church is a visible

society and since the social dimension of the liturgy is the common exercise of the virtue of religion, it is not possible to consider this virtue as simply a matter of concern for the private spiritual well-being of the individual. It is a consequence of God's redemptive plan in Christ that religion cannot be true and complete without exterior worship. Liturgy covers all aspects of religious acts and can thus be considered to be the form of religion in society. Exterior worship is a manifestation of faith. It is necessary that the mind be in harmony with the body, mere external attitudes are not enough, God wills that interior dispositions should have an outward manifestation. There has often been a certain tension between those who stress the importance of communal prayer to the detriment of personal prayer and *vice versa,* but those who live fully the life of the Church should not have any difficulties or feel any conflict in this matter.

Conclusion

It is in the liturgy that the People of God come into contact with revealed truth in a way which is often more comprehensible to them than the explicit statements of the Church's magisterium. It is the liturgy which safeguards the faith in virtue of its social aspect since the liturgy is neither an individual act nor is it organized on private initiative.

The liturgy is as much a human bond in society as a religious one. It is a source of strength for those who are alone, it strengthens the ties of families and friends and is the most sacred of all social relationships. It is in fact the strongest bond of all relationships because prayer is communion. If the renewed liturgical movement following upon the work of Second Vatican Council is to have an effect, it is necessary to follow the advice given by Bernard Lonergan in his study *Insight* "To strike out on a new line and become more than a weekend celebrity calls for years in which one's living is more or less constantly absorbed in the effort to understand". The time has come to get down to that painstaking, constantly absorbing work of seeking to understand liturgy.

"LITURGY AND SPIRITUAL LIFE" OR "LITURGICAL SPIRITUALITY"?

Achille M.Triacca, SDB

The theme dealt with in a symposium organised by the Institute of Spirituality at the Gregorian University in Rome, from April 25 to 28, 1991, was "Spirituality as Theology".[1] In my presentation I have tried to illustrate that the problems evolved and discussed about the insight of the nature of Christian spirituality in this century run parallel and at times converge into or diverge from the true understanding of the nature of liturgy.[2]

If, one intends to deepen into spirituality as theology, would necessarily include analogies and similarities to the cognizance of liturgy as theology.

Obviously this is not the place to discuss these questions. Yet it would be fitting at least to doubt about its existence in order to understand, in its skeleton form, what is discussed, for a personal study and to induce to comprehension on how liturgical spirituality constitutes the *animus* of the life of the Church (= 1). Therefore to keep in mind the nature of the liturgical spirituality (= 2) it would be helpful to discern the spiritual life of the faithful. To arrive at our aim of this contribution a third part should be inconcluded offering concrete practical applications. They would lead to initiate a phase of leading importance for the life of the Christian faithful. Due to the shortage of space the last point will not be dealt with.

---

[1] For the reports collected in the acts of the same symposium: C.A. BERNARD ed., *La spiritualità come teologia,* Cinisello Balsamo 1993.

[2] Cfr., "La riscoperta della liturgia", op. cit., pp.105-130.

1. The Liturgical Spirituality as "Life of the Church": a Glance at the Recent History, Perpetually "Teacher of Life"

If one were to deal with Spirituality in general, there are two directions of study as a possible starting point. There are studies that start from the Christian faithful and treat experiences of spiritual life as the basis of spirituality. In this sense each and every activity of *fidelis* in so far as it is *rationalis,* would become part of his spirituality. Others, on the other hand, start from the fact that it is always God[3] who is first to intervene in the life of the faithful, leaving the primacy to God and considering Christian spirituality as the response of the faithful to the intervention of the One-Triune God. It is a synergetic action between two poles "God-faithful": not thwarted poles, but mutual agents. Liturgical spirituality evidences this direction of osmotic and vital convergence of the Holy Spirit with the activities of the faithful who should always act ever more in Spirit and in Truth.[4] In order to understand how the self reflected consciousness of the life of the Church somehow directs attention to the importance of liturgical spirituality, which we take for granted and which will be treated later, I deposit two considerations. The first outlines the transition from liturgical movement to the liturgical spirituality starting from the liturgical reform. The second one tries to grasp and confine what one understands by liturgical spirituality, proceeding from method to reality.

1.1. From the "Liturgical Movement" to "Liturgical Spirituality" through the "Liturgical Reform"

Starting from the fact that liturgical celebrations do not exhaust the "liturgical" reality that embraces mystery, that is, the whole history of salvation which is present in the life of the

---

[3] Cfr.. I Jn. 4,10.19.

[4] Cfr., Jn. 4, 23; see also Rom. 12,1 and conceptual parallels.

faithful by means of celebration, in such a way that, the very life of the faithful may become a worship in Spirit and Truth according to the desire of Christ; one could affirm that the "future" of liturgy is tangled in the liturgical "today", depending on how we plan out reality today, tomorrow we shall gather the corresponding fruits.

1.1.1. Liturgical Reform or Renewal?

Thirty years after the promulgation of the Constitution on sacred liturgy, one should admit that most of the alteration or reform, as well as the renewel of the "Missal", the "Ritual", the "Pontifical" and the "Liturgy of the hours" have been carried out according to the precepts set by the Vatican Council II.

If it is up to scholars of liturgy to enunciate judgement on these thirty years, and to critics to blend with constructive considerations what is present in the official liturgical documents, it is the duty of all workers of the liturgy to mould their own actions according to concrete liturgical pastoral procedures.

Experience has demonstrated that liturgical reform without liturgical renewal compete the risk of carrying a liturgical formalism from one kind to another yet not being authentic; it would remain at a superficial level without gaining anything "intimately profound or profitable".

The liturgical reform changes the signs (words, gestures...) according to the standards of adaptability, suitability and opportunity. The liturgical renovation is aware of the fact that it is not the adaptation of the signs that brings about the conversion of a Christian and his adhesion to God but the conversion that conforms to the liturgical signs.

The liturgical reform has been dealing with, and will always be anxious changing and alterating the "structure of liturgical celebration". The liturgical renewal will deepen more and more into the vital participation of the liturgico -sacramental celebrations. The first oriented in giving life to the "during" of

the celebration, while the other strives in vitalizing and strengthening the "before" and the "after" of the celebration, achieving this by becoming aware of the fact that one cannot separate life from the liturgical celebration and vice versa; otherwise the result would be a dichotomy that would lead to aberrations and not to the liturgical realities.

The liturgical reform can be traced back in the past; it originates from the "liturgical movement" especially at the end of the past century and the beginning of this century. It has its origin in the liturgical restoration effort which, at times, could be seen as a certain kind of liturgical archeologism. Regarding the outlook of liturgical reform still has the past constitutionally inherent to it. The liturgical renewal, for the fact that it intends to be the soul of the reform itself, is rooted in the past, and is not rebellious against tradition and its teachings. However, at present it is a witness to the "day of the Lord" and its realities: therefore it is projected to the future to be able to bring the *"dies liturgicus"* to its eschatological fullness. Therefore, the liturgical renewal, even if it strives to gather all the treasures of the past putting together its more lively motives, revolted towards the forth coming, and orientates the present with the intention of influencing the future; while gazing to the past it intends to prolong its own axis. It exercises its own inventive capacity, starting from the observations of the past, and behaves like the scribe of the Gospel: draws new things from old ones; never turns back; has rather confidence in the fact that the past can emerge today, in the contemporary liturgical reform, a reality that is expected for tomorrow.[5]

Having infront of them a clear view of liturgical problems, liturgical reformers develop continuously a critical request for the realization of a living and vital liturgy; in as much

[5] The affirmation is in p.133 of A. AURBY, *È finito il tempo della liturgia?* Torino Leumann 1971. The original is in French.

as they recall operative attentions not to bind oneself to the liturgical "images" that may be in contrast with those truly tested and well founded according to scientific theological reflection on the liturgy. Those who bring into effect the liturgical renewal bring to perfection, from their part, a certain work of purification of what comes from liturgical reformers.

It is a hard task because practical and operative concepts that are not well approved and well balanced are found almost everywhere. Most often they are found in an implicit level, without a clear consciousness of the insufficiency or deficiency of the "image" of the liturgy that certain persons, circles, communities or parts of the local churches have made. Reflecting critically on the essence of certain expressions of liturgical reform, the discerner of the liturgical renewal seeks to offer prospectives that are more in accord with the liturgical reality; it tends to take very seriously the horizontal dimension of the tangible love for man, of his responsibility for "earthly tasks", and particularly the cultic-vertical dimension of the love of God. This dimension should assume more and more primacy as far as the very love of neighbour proceeds from the love for God and culminates in it. It is a question of logical and ontological primacy. The accomplishers of the liturgical renewal, in other words, intend to demonstrate that liturgy is not a question of Noachian realities (purely intellectual reality), of teaching, of formation extirpated from life; but is the concrete existence of "facts-events" to be fully lived. They are conscious of the fact that it is not a matter "of theory", but "of life", so much that one comes to theognosis (= knowledge and love of God) through liturgy, even without being instructed in theology (study of God).

It is no more a question of sustaining out or living the (celebrative exteriority) exterior celebrations (= liturgical reform), but is a matter of profound and intimate enrichment of the realities of praise to the Father, in Christ through the Spirit, in

order to be able to become more and more communicative, diffusive evangelizers of what is lived, of what one maintains; and one maintaining because one believes, one believes because one loves, one loves because one gives praise.

The liturgical reform is intended to avoid any form of purely mechanical, passive, formalistic, ritualistic or legalistic participation in the liturgy.[6] From this prospective reform has sought to create rites, formulae, signs that would stimulate a personal and communitarian response to the Word of God celebrated, experienced and animated (vitalized) in the liturgical celebration. Appealing to the heart of the "participants" and "celebrants," the liturgical renewal tries to render more lively and operative the potentiality so that renews what is proper to each generation of Christians, as each generation remains young and daring. It is liturgy that by nature maintains the principle "to recreate, redeem, restore, reform, regenerate, to be born anew, to renovate, to repair, to restitute." The liturgical renewal is rooted in Christian optimism and modulates the pastoral catechetical operative lines, full of juvenile force, fully conscious of the fact

---

[6] About the concept and the reality of "participation" in the liturgy, I must call the attention of the readers at least to three of my works on the subject that somehow complete and surpass one another. They are A.M. TRIACCA, "Partecipazione", in D. SARTORE - A.M. TRIACCA eds., *Nuovo Dizionario di Liturgia,* Roma 1984, 1990; Cinisello Balsamo 1993. In this are found the results of a "research on the sources of the Ambrosian liturgy" (see the acts of the liturgical study week - S. Sergio from 1976, published in Rome, 1977; the investigation is found in pp.269-305) and of a *metodological relation* appearing in the Miscellanea liturgica on the occasion of the 70th birthday of the Abbot Salvatore Marsilli, published in Torino-Leumann in 1981. (The contribution is on pp.261-287). Also, A.M. TRIACCA, "Partecipazione alla celebrazione liturgica. Per un 'bilancio pastorale' vent'anni dalla costituzione sulla Liturgia" in, AA.VV., *Costituzione liturgica "Sacrosanctum Concilium."* edited by the Congregation for the Divine Worship, Rome (1986), pp.201-224, Idem, "Solo partecipazione alla celebrazione liturgica o anche e soprattutto partecipazione liturgica? Dal passato al futuro", in AA.VV., Assisi 1956-1986. *Il movimento liturgico tra riforma conciliare e le attese del popolo di Dio,* Assisi 1 987, pp.331-365.

that to a poor catechesis and pastoral work corresponds a slovenly (careless) and clumsy liturgy, while a more vitalizing pastoral and catechesis encourage and help in arriving at a full life and a living liturgy.

In few words I can state that liturgical renewal is aware that "human life has no meaning if not liturgical... and not only human life, but all of creation",[7] however, it is preeminently conscious that we can live what we celebrate only if primarily we celebrate what we live.[8]

Naturally the latter affirmation has to be taken, as one would say, "with a pinch of salt" because it entails an authentic Christian life that involves the "celebration" in such a way that it may truly be the "summit and source" of every activity of the faithful who, together, constitute the Church[9] along with the life of every faithful who forms part of the same mystical person, i.e., the mystical body of Christ.

1.1.2. Liturgical Renewal and/or Liturgical Spirituality?

A considerable amount of confusion exists in different works of the so-called liturgists and cultic-theoreticians of spirituality, which, if it were only matters of terminology, one could perhaps refrain from pronouncing any judgement. But the fact is, beyond the terminology used, the same realities are not clear at all.

What is entailed is the courtesy attention of the following expressions: "ascetics and liturgy", "mystic and liturgy, (life of) contemplation and liturgy"; "life of prayer"; "the spiritualities

---

[7] My translation of the expression found in p.34 of J.J. VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramental,* Neuchatel 1964.

[8] I have quoted here what I had written years ago because it possesses still its full relevance and actuality. See A.M. TRIACCA, "Reforma liturgica e rinnovamento liturgico", *Liturgia* 8 (1974) 481-484.

[9] Cfr., *Sacrosanctum Concilium,* 10.

and liturgical spirituality", "liturgical spiritual theology and liturgical spirituality, sic et simpliciter," etc.

It would be necessary to have an aetiological study on these binominal expressions and on the way and tonality used by each and every scholar according to one's different cultural situation and in conformity with the option made for one or more of the different spiritualities found in the core of Christianity. Without entering into a detailed examination, I want to state that the theological problems therein contained are not to be discarded as petty. Moreover, there are opposite extremes which are considered by some as irreconcilable. In fact liturgical spirituality would clash with personal piety, as if this would be a kind of methodical piety, and the other only communitarian (?). In this sense liturgical spirituality would be a mere school of prayer or a methodology for one among the many forms of piety (devotion) and nothing more (?). So is liturgical spirituality a principle of the Christian life or simply a consequence of living-up to one's faith (? !), etc.

Facing these and other questions that could be brought forward, I would try to be brief and to the point, crystallizing the main inadequate interpretations of liturgical spirituality that are in fashion today and the product of opposing tendencies.

1) Liturgical spirituality cannot become a pretext (an excuse) to substitute or rapidly suppress the forms that the ecclesial tradition (the universal church, the local church, religious-communitarian life) conveys to the life of the Christian faithful. In fact, one could devise a kind of separation or break in the ecclesial vitality. It is the proper inadeguate interpretation with no other target than newness to a certain type of "spiritual iconoclasts" or of "recipe-makers".

The other side of the coin of this inadequate view consists in the fact that, liturgical spirituality should be the "fermentum" of every form of spirituality: not substitution but

nourishment; not graftings but vitalization; not superimpositions but stress.

2) Liturgical spirituality cannot be envisaged as means to justify the end. That would mean reducing it to a mere spiritual methodology. If this happens no wonder then that some Christians may simply opt for Zen or yoga rather than being satisfied with liturgical spirituality.

It is the attitude of those who explore short-cuts and easy-goingness that over exert the means to arrive promptly at the goal fix before-hand; they dismiss and disregard the fruits of the Spirit.

Opposite to such prominence is sought by the effort of those who, in the field of spiritual life, mantain well-defined levels the means and the different methodologies, knowing how to gather the "quid" that constitutes the substance of the liturgical spirituality, which, in its turn, is the soul of every Christian spirituality.

3) Liturgical spirituality cannot be considered, "sic et simpliciter" as an instrument to raise the grade of veneration of mutable forms, though being indispensable, of determinate spiritualities that derive from liturgical spirituality and are inspired to it, to the detriment of the primacy of spirit of the perennial liturgy.

This is what happened to some superficial spiritual directors who have reduced liturgical spirituality to a mere practice analogous to other spiritualities. The same happens to those who, embarking from the demands and conditions of man, find it impossible (or hardly successful or in a reductive way) to redimension man giving back his status in the order of the liturgical realities.

The reverse side of the coin is to be sought in a way of action taken by those who, desiring to pursue what is inserted in liturgical spirituality, respect what is proper to the course of relationship between liturgical spirituality and other spiritualities.

Without lingering on listing and scrutinizing inadequate concepts of liturgical spirituality, not to risk falling into any vicious circle (one speaks of liturgical spirituality without having in any way defined its boundaries), I limit myself to some snapshots; It is certain that the inadequate interpretations are all to be branded to a deeper diagnosis. These are present in the ecclesial ingredient and exercise a negative influence.

Also for spiritual animator, it would be worthwhile seeking clear ideas rather than limiting to certain mental habits simulated during the period of formation, correctly updating were necessary.

However, from my initial diagnostic analysis of the inadequate interpretations of liturgical spirituality follows:

- the need of a theoretical specification of the aberrant forms that are circulating in the ecclesial framework;

- the advantage of a team-reflection on the facts highlighting the co-ordinates that determine the inadequate forms of liturgical spirituality in the practical field and to propose then the necessary remedies;

- the urgent need of introducing a necessary distinction, even though it may be risky.

There is in vogue among the liturgists a distinction (which in itself is sustained) between *liturgical spirituality* as *"science" or theological discipline,* and *liturgical spirituality* as *the vitality of the being-acting of a Christian.*

I said distinction, but I would better say *confusion* between the two levels, for which is not all clear and as a result conflicting among the scholars themselves regarding to the where-abouts liturgical spirituality should be considered; as a science or as a theological discipline. Consequently, the field of

liturgical spirituality suffers as the vitality of "being-acting of Christian".[10]

Starting from the actively discussed fact of liturgical spirituality as a theological discipline, in general, at least at times, even distinguished scholars of spirituality run the risk of eluding in practice the vital sphere or ignoring the liturgical spirituality or relegating it where it does not merit. Indeed, a furthur question should be asked:

1.1.3. "Christian Spirituality",[11] but of What Realm?

Two dictionaries that dealt with liturgy, prior to Vatican II, had the following positions on matters of spirituality:

In the Italian translation of the *Dizionario pratico di liturgia romana,* edited by ROBERTO LESAGE (Editrice Studium, Roma 1956), the reader encounters an insignificant emphasis on Ascetics (p.478) in the *Bibliografia generale* (pp.477-480) regarding Mass.

In the other work, namely *l'Enciclopedia liturgica,* translated into Italian from French (of 1947; the first edition goes back to 1931), edited by R. AIGRAN (Ed. Paoline, Alba 1957), where an article written by M.H. LAVOCAT, *la liturgia e la spiritualità* (ivi. 57-63) dealing with "how the question is to be posed", then proceeds treating in three paragraphs the following three points: "the spiritual life", "life of the soul united to the body", and "the liturgy, school of equilibrium". All these in the first chapter: *principio.* In that of the *Glorificazione di Dio* (II°) the titles are, "sia santificato il tuo nome"; "La glorificazione della Ss. Trinità". The third chapter "La somiglianza con Gesù

---

[10] See the work of A.G. MATANIC, *La spiritualità come scienza,* Cinisello Balsamo 1990 and op.cit. in the note 1 of Bernard.

[11] I would like to go back to one of my previous contributions. See A.M. TRIACCA, "Per una definizione di spiritualità cristiana nell'ambito liturgico", in *Notitiae* 25 (1989) 277-288, especially 277-282.

partecipazione alla liturgia". To these are added two other chapters: *Benèfici effetti per l'anima,* (IV°), with "la liturgia, principio unificatore;" "la preghiera liturgica e gli slanci della carità". Very limited if we take into consideration the fact that all five chapters occupy simply six pages! One can refer to the following works of A. DE SERRENT, *Spiritualità liturgica* (Vita e Pensiero, Milano 1934) and of G.M. BRASO', *Liturgìa y espiridualidad* (Abadia de Monserrat, Barcellona 1956). And in the book of C. VAGAGGINI, *Il senso teologico della liturgia. Saggio di liturgia generale* (Edizioni Paoline 1957[1], 1958[2], 1965[4]) in the section dedicated to *Liturgia e Vita,* the first chapter, (XXI) deals with "ex professo": *Liturgia e spiritualità.* Vagaggini, in seeking not to displease anybody, diplomatically handles the problems rotating around the theme, "La spiritualità e le spiritualità. Nozioni e caratteristiche generali della spiritualità liturgica. Lo sforzo ascetico nella tendenza alla perfezione e la spiritualità liturgica; Vita mistica e spiritualità".

All the perplexities, pursuable traits, swayings, hesitations, I believe, seem to have prevented eloquent expressions in Vatican II, except that little clause of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* no.16 where is expressed that liturgy should have its place among the major disciplines and it should be taught also under the aspect of spirituality. And teachers of spirituality are invited to explain the mystery of Christ and the sacred history in a manner that clearly indicates the relationship between spirituality and liturgy. Consequently the grant of priestly formation may stand bear fruits.

Here problems become acute as it is evident that spirituality and liturgy are channeled solely for the formation of priests. Besides, here one speaks of the "spiritual aspect" of the liturgy. "Ne verbum quidem" about the fact of liturgical spirituality, let alone liturgy being in itself Christian spirituality.

At this point, in order to be able to carry on the line of thought in view of the contribution from the liturgical field to a

possibile definition of spirituality, I assert within the following paragraph (which in itself is questionable), other questions motivated by some facts belonging to the ecclesial framework of the past and present.

1.3.1.1. A Real Problem, or Just Theory?

It seems that one returns to the same point over and again. In fact, in order to be able to speak about liturgical spirituality, one need to have clear ideas at least about these two points: what spirituality[12] is and what liturgy[13] is.

- It is more than clear that if for spirituality one intends the experiential dimension of a reality, then I can talk of a materialistic spirituality which by itself is a contradiction "in terminis".

Perhaps an experiential dimension of liturgy for some faithful or for most of them will never have "in via". Therefore, one could not ever speak of liturgical spirituality.

But in the realm of Christianity, spirituality would be the Christian spirituality "sic et simpliciter," i.e., the result of a way of living, of thinking, of acting, etc. according to Christian ethics. In this connotation it seems that liturgy is limited and is not able to augment; the publication of the fifth volume of the *Corso di Morale* edited by TULLIO GOFFI - GIANNINO PIANA (Queriniana, Brescia 1986), in which the title of the volume: *Liturgia (Etica della relgione)* fluster the realities "Liturgia e religiosità", even though they are related. This disarray needs to be dealt with profoundly, something to be tackled elsewhere.

---

[12] Also the contribution of M.DUPUY, "Spiritualité", in *Dictionaire de Spiritualité Ascétique et mystique, Doctrine et histoire* 13 (Paris 1989) coll. 1142-1152; 14 (Paris 1990) coll. 1153-1173; it is not exhaustive nor does it bring a right solution to the problems we are dealing with.

[13] See the work of S. MARSILI, "Liturgia", in D. SARTORE - A.M. TRIACCA, *Nuovo Dizionario di Liturgia,* (Cinisello Balsamo 1993 676-692 and bibliography, p.692.

Spirituality is the theological reflection on Christian life from the Christian life. In other words, it deals with the life of Christian: life in spirit and truth, of spiritual life, i.e., life of the faithful on which one reflects to gather all that is therein present, as constant, cataloguable and classifiable: yet questioning by which criterion? It is here that the enigmatic question of methods or the school of ascetics and mystics arises, as they were commonly called up to now; today one would prefer speaking of spirituality schools.

Spirituality, then, would be reduced to mere techniques for living. Such techniques would permit us to classify the experiences of knowledge, the experiences in spirit and life. This being the case, then spiritual experience of a Christian would be the Christian spirituality. To all these, and more, some confront (or try to) even liturgy, but fathomed at there pleasure, and not in the procedure its reality entails.

For this reason it is already - as it should be said -"remote to fighting" - and understands nothing of liturgical spirituality he who pretends to detect spirituality from ceremonies (juridical view of the liturgy), from the celebrations considered in view of the faithful (pastoralistic view of the liturgy), from the celebrations viewed and considered inculturated in an ethnic group (neo-esthetic view of the liturgy) and from the celebrations considered as an ensemble of symbols, of language, exactly liturgical (catechetical - anthropological vision of liturgy). These are views so partial and distorting as to render the reality "liturgy" wrongly, if not erroneously.

It seems that the very concept of spirituality may emerge from considerations dealing with the reality "liturgy". But for this aim it would not be out of place remembering that the liturgical movement has been presented as a spiritual movement. For this reason it had been contested.[14] Also the goals that the movement

[14] See my new work quoted above in note 2.

has provisionally reached (because they were ends that were "leading to something else") in the Second Vatican Council and in the postconciliar liturgical reform, seem to be obtained by some "fixed", who, to keep themselves alive are always there on the defensive protecting and defending, not knowing what and what for?

It is not my intention to discuss here what liturgy is. If one does not want to fall into problematicism, even if only theoretical, but consider it propitious keeping both extremes of the discussion in the problematic life, then it would be necessary to entice some fixed points on common to all.

1) Here and now, is to be refused as is agreed by all that, theoretically, one can deepen into spirituality as a discipline with its objects and methods, and liturgy as an autonomous discipline with its proper method and purpose.

2) Moreover, the discussion ought to be centered on the convergent parallelism, or on certain osmotic inter changeabilities that exist between liturgy and spirituality. This could lead to a possibile definition of spirituality (such as the one given furthur on in this study).

Therefore *no* to every form of theoretic problematicism, in view of an *yes* to the real life problems that can induce a researcher to formulate adequate answers.

1.1.3.2. Purely Historical Distinctions, or Modern Contradictions?

Every epoch is indebted to its predecessors, for improvements or mischieves. At the same time, every era lays down presuppositions for the morrow generation. Our era has inherited some antinomies about the subject in dialogue. I solicit to spotlight the main ones.

(1) Inheritance of the remote past[15]: By his I mean Christian antiquity and middle ages.

a) Segregation in the forms of life of the faithful. Gradually the monk becomes the ideal for a believer. The history of monasticism, in which the following three levels are high-lighted, is yet to be written.

- monk = a true faithful, and nothing more. Certainly a true faithful regarding the specific vocation that he has received;

- monk = one who set himself apart from the faithful, and makes use of certain ascetical methods. Here already one sees the aberration of separating liturgy from the monk and the monk from liturgy, a way many scholars generally handle it.

- monk = a faithful whose spirituality, being that of a Christian, cannot but be liturgical.

b) Progressive divergences between spiritual experiences and liturgical celebrations of which they lack the type of experience intellectuals and pastoralists bear. Note well: already the liturgy is seen as a rudimentary instance of celebration.

c) Different theological schools (Franciscan, scholastic, etc.) in relation to different spiritualities. In other words, separation between theology, liturgy and life. This is the nucleus of the breach in harmony between the life of the faithful, the "sensus fidelium", that division resulted in jumble.

(2) Inheritance from the near past: i.e., the modern and contemporary epoch.

a) The changed meaning between phrases "following Christ, imitation of Christ, life in Christ" from the emerging need of a common meaning for the person of Christ that different Christian spiritualities put always at the center, in a way so that

---

[15] Cfr., A.M. TRIACCA, "Rilievi critici in vista di una 'epistemologia' della spiritualità liturgica" in B.CALATI - B.SECONDIN - T.P.ZECCA (eds.) *Spiritualità: fisionomia e compiti,* Roma 1981, 115-128.

every Christian spirituality may seek to relate to Christ and remembering his mystery. But is not this perhaps liturgy?

b) From here we see attempts, more or less successful to refocus the spiritual experience on Christ. One may think positively or negatively about the "devotio moderna", and their influence on the reawakening of the right meaning of the liturgy and the collateral confusion between spirituality as something isolated and the life of the faithful.

c) The polemics that arose with the liturgical movement. These seemed settled by "Mediator Dei" but they still flare up and doubtless do harm to the unity of purpose proper to the common spirituality of all the faithful.

The diagnosis of the inheritance could go on. Undoubtedly, the inheritance of dichotomies grows more acute today when they revolt into contradictions.

3) Contradictions from today's ecclesial life: a quick look at the contradictions more directly related to the subject.

a) The contradictory antithesis or just plain contradiction that someone claimed (and continue claiming) to exist between contemplation and liturgy, between mental prayer and celebration, etc.

b) The confusion between Christian experience and spirituality. Pychological phenomena including simple experience, sic et simpliciter", are not the same as spirituality. Hence the fact that objectivity, of which the liturgy justly takes pride, continues to create contrasts with the experiential ambit that can have remarkable weight on objectivity; but it is not, in itself objective. Rather, it habitually moves along the sphere from subjectiveness to indefinite.

c) The ambiguity of superimposing the religious realm on the liturgical. The liturgy contains religion in itself. But not every religion is liturgy. Analogous contradiction is present in

the ethics attributed to the liturgy as if every ethic is involved in the liturgy.

This is how contradiction between the ethico-religious and liturgy arises. On the other hand these contradictions (and others), in their turn, create difficulties in approaching such realities roughly defined as:

spirituality - spiritual life - Christian experience
liturgy - liturgical life - spiritual life

Now, on the top of these antinomies we find always the question about the adequate method defy the core of the problem. In fact, before these (and other) data, an urgent and fundamental question comes to mind: what method should be used to come to something useful, that as many as possible would agree to?

On the other hand, it is worth asking: from spiritualities to spirituality or from spirituality to the spiritualities?

It is here that the matter becomes ever more cogent. In fact, in the sphere of spirituality that constitutes the *animus* and the *anima* of the life of Christian; it is liturgical spirituality that brings about the transition from *signum* to *veritas.* For this - in the thrift of this presentation - after having alluded to the tormented transition (that came about in the theoretic field, and which ought to take effect more and more in the practical - pastoral field) between the liturgical movement and liturgical spirituality, moving from the intermediary stage to the reform (cfr. above 1.1.1 and 1.1.2.), I believe it expedient to lay down some considerations that would help focusing on the "concept-reality" of liturgical spirituality.

1.2. Liturgical Spirituality: from Method to its Nature

Without doubt the interest in "liturgical spirituality" is very alive in the Church. I remember three initiatives that reveal this interest regarding our theme. In 1982 the 19th study week on liturgy held at the faculty of Orthodox Theology of St.Sergious in Paris dealt with the theme "liturgy - spirituality - culture". The subject and the matters to be treated were prepared in 1981.[16]

The "Societas liturgica internationalis", in the Congress held in Vienna in 1983, dealt with the theme "Liturgy and Spirituality".[17]

The association of professors and scholars of liturgy of Italy dedicated their 20th study week (August 25-30, 1991) to "Liturgy and Spirituality".[18]

Thus, in the span of ten years (1981-1991), three national or international meetings dealt with the topic. Obviously the results of these initiatives are partial and have not in any way clarified the key points. So I ask:

1.2.1. Which Method?

This question bears a series of questions. I have tried to answer them with a series of apophthegms, first practical

---

[16] See the Acts: A.M. TRACCIA - A. PISTOIA (eds.), *Liturgie -Spiritualité - Cultures. Conferences Saint-Serge XXIXe Semaine d'études liturgiques,* Roma 1983. My preface in pp.7-9. In pp.317-339 the presentation concerning the theme of the Genoa's meeting, titled "La Spintualité liturgique est-elle possible? De la méthode á la vie". Note that basically it is the same version of the work quoted in the preceeding number. However, noteworthy changes have been introduced to it.

[17] The reports can be read in French in the periodical *La Maison-Dieu,* and in English in *Studia Liturgica,* of 1984.

[18] See the acts in AA.VV., *Liturgia e Spiritualità.* "Bibliotheca Ephemerides Liturgicae Subsidia", 64 / "Studi di Liturgia. Nuova Serie", 23 (Rome 1992).

principles, whose nature would induce anyone to accept them without hesitation. They, still, remain a matter to be deepened, therefore I suggest noticing the following points.

(1) First Principles of Method

a) Theory can distinguish between one spirituality and another; praxis must blend them together. Indeed theory must distinguish because of the need to inquiry; praxis must, with Christian wisdom, bring spiritualities together in order not to create one-eyed crippled or handicapped Christians.

b) Where one wants to inquire regarding the distinction between spiritualities, one must immediately place the "particular" in a global view of Christian life which is practically the same "yesterday, today and always". In fact, that which others, elsewhere, in a different manner have lived (or will live) is fundamentally the same that one lives today, here and now, though varying their specific tonality.

c) Where research is made without living it, no authentic vision of Christian spirituality is obtained. But where one lives the divine life, even though without any formal research, he or she is enabled to deepen in.

d) Where mystique tries to dominate the mystery, then it is mystery that degenerates into mysticism. On the other hand, where it is the mystery that reigns over mysticism the result produces true Christian spirituality, that is, liturgico-sacramentarian spirituality.

It is more than evident the need to focus one's attention on those erroneous views which are being circulated, even today, and basically threatens to formulate the adequate method for a solution to the subject at hand.

(2) Erroneous Views that Threaten rather than to Understand that True Spirituality is Liturgy

To begin with, let me draw your attention on the following points:

a) Human virtues or Christian virtues? Equating faith to confidence, hope to longing, charity to philanthropy: in this sense the liturgy is no longer understood as spirituality.

b) Partial theological views and/or theology in its globality? Partial (even though not erroneous) christological views harm the liturgy. The heart of the matter is Christ the Supreme Being and Eternal Priest. If this truth is not taken into consideration, forgotten, hampered, etc. liturgy pays the price. There are also inadequate ecclesiological views that harm the nature of liturgy, and hence spirituality. Similarly, the lack of pneumatology in the theoretic field, means incomprehension in the practical field: which is liturgical spirituality.

c) Elitist tendencies with short-lived positions? These are spiritual facts.

d) The confusion between Christianity and other religions with the collateral Babel of method and content. The methods are interchangeable (probably without causing any harm). The contents are different, differentiable and differentiating.

Putting it differently, the way to understand liturgy - spirituality is not in drive because generally one comes forward with approximate definitions of what may be spirituality and definitions so partial (which are also erroneous) of what may be liturgy.

One could probably discuss whether or not it is legitimate to compare the two realities that could perhaps be in a superposition because they are mutually "fusible". Or rather, given the evidence of some facts (and of some apophthegms and first principles), the problem would die at birth if it were

confronted an appropriate manner. So, here are some considerations of method deriving from facts.

3) The Method Deriving from Some Facts

If we patiently evaluate some facts in all their implications, perhaps one might approach or even arrive at an appropriate method more swiftly.

a) Considering in a global manner current studies in the field of spirituality, it is to be observed that the theorists of the so-called schools of spirituality, should, before paying attention to the specific nature of every school or of every spirituality, know the common denominator present in each of them. The basic ground from which the characteristics and/or the peculiarities of each single spirituality grow constitute the proper liturgico-sacramentarian spirituality proper to every faithful.

b) Reflection upon some studies that insistently summon the question to: *where primacy should be attributed, whether to life or to celebration,* one should assert in finding Christians who are not yet aware of what is in their hands and in their existence: the liturgy. This should not be confussed with celebration. This is the highest expression, but not sole of the reality "liturgy".

All the consequences that originate from treating the theme or the terms of the question wrongly way, guarantee at an early stage the intentions of enrichment to the osmotic interchangability between celebration, Christian life and liturgy.

c) Someone willing to face problems of this arrange should undergo a progressive decodification of dichotomic mentalities inherited from the past. This *pars destruens* postulates and demands a collateral and concomitant *pars aedificans.* It is necessary to deepen the codifications that come from these contributions creating deviations which cause change in the ecclesiastical set up. For example, certain kind of devotions, "post-factum", brought along an enrichment, even though initially were launched declasified with respect to the central

nucleus from which they departed. Hence the necessity to study well the origins or the roots (aetiology) of every practical form of Christian spirituality and its goal (Teleology) in order to rediscover the aetiology and the teleology in a distinctily yet unique matrix, that is, the liturgico-sacramental spirituality. Otherwise we would be dealing merely with auxiliary techniques, rather then with a real spirituality in the Christian field, even though they initiated from it.

But the importance of the method used depends also from where the research begins. For this reason I would like to call the attention to another problem, providing the answer to which, in my opinion, one can be on the way of finding a rather satisfactory solution, that is:

1.2.2. From Which Point of View Should One Begin?

If I begin affirming that the atom is by definition indivisible I would not bother explaining the theory of how could it be divided. In the same way, in our case, if we procede by taking a wrong direction, we would immediatly find ourselves immobile. Therefore I perceive at the outset itself that in proposing some points before starting off, I should remember that all start from a centre towards the periphery or simultaneously from the periphery towards a centre. Strictly speaking, there is no problem of priority, but only of simultaneity.

In fact, one could predict departing from different points, yet the direction would always be either centrifugal or centripetal, and in any case unidirectional to the centre.

1) Toward a Lived and Examined Christianity

A good number of scholars, deepening the theme "spirituality", initiate from this point. Unfortunately, though this point may find approval among some of them, it still remains an ambiguous one. It is for an elite. It excludes from spirituality

those not capable of consciously reflecting on their actions, such as children, mentally retarded, comatose. The Christian life would not necessarily requires consciously reflected act in order to be Christian.

2) In the Ethico-religious Direction, Naturally Christian

Even here recessing all the attempts to define spirituality that borrows from the common human-religious way of living the datum of the human heart that has no rest if not in God.

The "Christian" belongs to the realm of "Ipse prior", of the initiative of God, of revelation, of the human-divine synergy, of the historicity. Hence the real tension of the Christian life that makes Christian spirituality neither more nor less than liturgico - sacramental spirituality, where the direction of the ethico-religious is that of the ethico-religious typically biblico-historico-ecclesial reactivated in view of the future.

3) In the Direction of the "Christian Virtuoso"

Here one intends concentrating on the fact that the faithful at heart is a virtuous Christian. His foundation is the infused virtues of faith, hope and charity. From virtuous Christian to Christian of virtue all the mystery-sacramental stages are located in which the communion (koinonial) dynamisms with the divine Persons are realized. The filter, the behaviour, the catalyst of these dynamisms is the celebration. But the whole life and every activity of the faithful are directed to it as summit and source.

4) In the Direction of Christ

Christ is the author and completion of faith, rock and anchor of hope, mercy-love of the Father. The virtuous Christian is for the *sequela Christi,* supreme and eternal Priest. The self-identification with the person of Christ, not in a noetic manner, not only in an ascetico-mimetical way, but in an

existential way, in a merciful-salvific ontology, is realized in the maximal steps that He has placed in the life of Christians: the sacraments. At least in an implicit manner they are responsible for the reality of the life of the Christian, that is, of the faithful whose spirituality is not the result of something addictive, but deeply rooted in what constitutes his being.

5) In the Direction of the Holy Spirit

The route from Christ to his Spirit proceeds simultaneously. In fact, there is neither Christ without the Holy Spirit, nor Holy Spirit without Christ.[19] The same is true for the Christian! To start from this point of view is to assert that the reality of all spirituality draws its life and energy from the Holy Spirit which flourishes where there is the Church and drives towards Christ. Christian spirituality is that which is Pneuma-amalgamated, to be Father-finalized, while it is Christ-centred. Neither more nor less than the characteristics of liturgico-sacramentarian spirituality, that is, neither more nor less than those dimensions needed for the comprehension of the Christian life "sic et simpliciter."

6) In the Direction of the History of Salvation Present in the Church

The history of salvation is being enacted in an implicit way in the created cosmos. In an explicit way, and in a renewable way, it takes place in the Church. The Church, is the place of the communitarian experience "de facto" (before it can be said to be personal) of salvation: place of personal experience (because it is communitarian-personal) of salvation (in act) that takes place in view of the "Ecclesia". The Church as the place where the

---

[19] For an ensamble of the thirteen principles of interest for the enrichment of what is being talked about here, see A.M. TRIACCA, "Pneumatologia, epicletologia o paracletologia? Contributo alla comprensione della presenza ed azione dello Spirito Santo da alcune visuali della teologia liturgica", *Salesianum* 48 (1986) 67-107.

"religio" becomes true because it participates in the truth, that is, the place where there is spirituality in as much as the faith becomes a continuous conversion: hope is changed into something concrete; charity is action. All these because by virtue of the Holy Spirit the Church is not separable from Christ and Christ from the individual faithful who is in the Church.

The various points of view from which one could begin in order to proceed to a method of study, coincide to the points from which one should begin to live the liturgico-sacramentarian reality. In other words, the method and the multiple contents merge together. Indeed using the right method brings us back to the nature of liturgical spirituality.

2. The Nature of Liturgical Spirituality

This field encounters many difficulties. My intention would be only to convey some help to formulate an answer, the least insufficient, I believe.

One could almost anticipate a kind of synthesis that emerge from the *helps* that will be furnished here, together with the assertion that the nature of liturgical spirituality is to be sought simultaneously in the "constitution of the Christian faithful" in whom the *living in Christ, acting with Christ, belonging to the Church and in favour of the Church, in virtue of the Holy Spirit* is one and the same. Yet I shall proceed step by step.

2.1. In the Field of Theory or Study

Two centres of interest that merit the attention of the scholar are presented here. His efforts will help when it comes to the practical field.

2.1.1. Problems to be Resolved

At the outset itself I would like to recall that to provide an exhaustive answer to this question, several other problems

would have to be resolved, even though are deeply rooted in the prime question. It is a matter of having resolved the following series of questlions: What is spirituality? What is spirituality as a theological discipline? What is the realm of various spiritualities? Does one exclude the other?, etc.[20]

But it is evident that the questions ought to be reformulated, "perhaps, if one knew what liturgical spirituality is, one might be able to resolve the questions too?".

If we permit, at least for the moment, that "princeps analogatum" of every so called spirituality is liturgical spirituality, then, finally, the other questions would find suitable answers. But it is evident that here we run the risk of making a "petitio principii" a never ending argument.

I think we need other means to understand the *quid* of the liturgical spirituality. It is a question of more positive-practical lines.

2.1.2. The Historico-comparative-liturgical Study and Reflection

It is a question of reading the data of history on the presence of the mystical body of Christ, animated by the Holy Spirit during the course of centuries among different peoples. From this it follows that, in such a context, the history of the sacraments, or the history of liturgy, would be nothing else than the history of the different ways Christ makes himself present among the people of God by the power of the Holy Spirit and acts in and with the living members, sanctifying them for the glory of God. In other words it is a matter of thoroughly examining that historical panorama about which I have spoken above (1.1). At least there would be four centres of interest that would enable us to formalize the nature of the liturgical spirituality.

---

[20] See above, especially 1.1.3.

First centre: The history of the Church from the point of view of hagiography. The saints are as a whole - with specific modalities and tonalities - the greatest "incarnators" of liturgical spirituality, and as a consequence are those who make the history of the Church so vital, living and long-lasting.

Second centre: The history of spiritual movements in the core of Christianity: The history of orthodox movements, in order to bring to light that their vitality is rooted in the liturgical spirituality. Also useful is the history of heterodox movements, that have gone or will go adrift, to trace that their partial or temporary vitality from those sparks of liturgical spirituality.

Third centre: The vitality of different generations of Christians. The more a local church vividly lives liturgical spirituality the more it becomes apostolically fertile, exploding in missionary activities.

Forth centre: Official documentation of the Holy Church. From the magisterium of the Supreme Pontiffs of the past and present to the official interventions of different Church commissions and to the Councils, there is a slow but progressive advance towards an awareness that the spirituality of the Church is liturgico - sacramentarian spirituality.

This sector will be still more vivified by notable contributions to the comprehension of the nature of liturgical spirituality, if historical and cross-cultural data are seriously taken into consideration, studying their relationship diacronically and sincronically and compared objectively from the East and Western point of view.

2.2. In Practice

This call to cause the method and the finality (= ad quid) of liturgical spirituality. It is easy to "crystallize" that the reality (= quid) can be clarified eliminating what is unecessary and useless, while including what enhances the nature of liturgical spirituality.

2.2.1. From the Finality to the Reality

Given that the nature and efficacy are an *unum*, disassembled by the intelligence to arrive at the structure of a given reality, it could be affirmed that a methodological line serving to high-light the nature of liturgical spirituality should originate from the fact and the truth enclosed in the "ad quid" to arrive at the "quid."

Well then, from an accurate examination of the data that come from what has been illustrated above, it has to be admitted that the "quid" is bound not so much and/or only from the "proper synthetic order of different elements common to each catholic spirituality as means to arrive at that perfection determined by the self-same liturgy", nor only to the "tendency to unify all the spiritual activity of the individual conforming and incorporating it into the worship of the Church".[21]

Instead let us try to establish that the so-called liturgical spirituality is related to the following key points:[22]

-- Every truly Christian spirituality has its source and summit in the liturgico-sacramentarian reality;

-- the Christian spiritual life is handed down to us, develops, matures, and arrives at perfection, above all through and by means of liturgy.

-- the vitality present in every Christian spirituality can be reduced to a tonality and modality to live what liturgically and what is produced by it.

Thus it can be asserted that the "quid" of the liturgical spirituality is to be sought in being baptized in Christ, by power of the Holy Spirit, and nourished by the body and blood of the same Christ. These truths and realities, renewed periodically,

---

[21] The affirmations are found in pp.201-205 of G.M. BRASO', *Liturgia e spiritualità,* Roma 1958. The original in Catalano, is of 1956.

[22] Some concepts explained above are now re-examined yet placed within a different context.

ought to be lived in a growth process towards maturity in Christ, in the power of the Holy Spirit and through the other sacraments that accompany the life of a Christian. In other words liturgical spirituality is the authentic exercise of Christian life as life in Christ, supreme and eternal Priest by the power of the Holy Spirit.

2.2.2. Arguments by Exclusion and Inclusion

At this point another line of thought contributes in determining the true nature of liturgical spirituality. As mentioned above, it is a matter of drawing a list of opinions regarding liturgical spirituality that circulate in today's Church structure and classify them to exclude aberrant ones and those that do not exactly define the truth belonging to liturgical spirituality. Here one encounters some descriptions given to the nature of liturgical spirituality that seriously engage in a rigorous effort and to an 'enrichment of the question. Not all the "common places" that swift from one side to the other of the ocean or across European borders, similar to an interesting game of table tennis, would overcome the test.

To be excluded are all the views that contribute to the nature of liturgical spitituality:

a) Where a possible rupture could occure between spirituality and liturgy or, a separation between the celebrative moment, and Christian life.

b) Wherever there are characteristics opposite to those proper to liturgical spirituality. This would apply to those who insist on prerogatives, such as: individualism, personalism, subjectivism, etc., that heavily diverge from the liturgical way.

c) Only at the celebrative moment of liturgical-sacramental actions. Such views take away life and day-to-day Christian existence from the jurisdiction of the liturgical spirituality.

As a consequence it would seem necessary to prepare a list of the descriptions of the nature of liturgical spirituality that are to be kept in mind because they can be, and ought to be kept in mind. Here the task becomes difficult because a question prunes up even before drawing the list. It is a matter of being conscious of the fact that the nature of liturgical spirituality is in relationship with the question of the definition of "liturgy".

2.3. From the Definition and from the Reality "Liturgy" to the Nature of the Liturgical Spirituality

Here lies the true core of the question: Once the nature of liturgy has been defined, it will be less complicated to establish the reality of the liturgical spirituality.

This is also what recent history teaches us. The strident debate of the first decades of the century fell into ambiguity on liturgical spirituality because it was moulding on easy "clichés" that projected the liturgy reducing it to rubrics or to mere sacred archeologism or aestheticism as its goal, or to simple theological definitions classified then as inadequate. This is not the place to analyze the definitions attributed to liturgy. Others, such as Schmidt and Marsili, have already done this authoritatively. I would just like to draw the attention to the two following facts:

I) The definition of liturgy cannot be achieved "a priori". Not to run the risk of falling into relativism, it is worth giving an insight into the documents of the Magisterium of the Church. These do not provide a definition as we are accostumed to but offers definable terms and elements necessary to draw a definition.

2) In the list of elements for a possibile definition, abides a maturing process, for example, from the Encyclical "Mediator dei" to the Constitution of Vatican II "Sacrosanctum Concilium". This implies that we are still heading towards a teeming definition of liturgy. It would be worth thinking about the growing integration from Vatican II regarding the Holy Spirit

and his action, in relation to the defition of liturgy. Making a synthesis of the analysis (not object of the present study) of the elements contained in the official documents and there follow-up, to the ecclesial of tomorrow, one should acknowledge that liturgy has simultaneously the following three levels: *Mystery-Action-Life* interwoven with the dimensions of *anamnesis, epiclesis* and *methaxis.*

2.3.1. The Descriptive Definition of "Liturgy"

In effect, from what has been said so far, liturgy is the "Mysterion" (total, synthesized in the paschal mystery) celebrated (in the action par excellence: the liturgical celebration) for life (of the people of God, that is, of the faithful in the Body of Christ, the Church); and at the same time, liturgy is the life of the faithful in Jesus Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit which finds its climax in the liturgical action because the "Mysterion" realizes itself in the today of the Church, "to renew the face of the earth" and to render glory to the Trinity.

By itself the sacred action par excellence, that is the liturgical celebration, does not consume the "liturgical" reality which is more extensive than the reality of "celebration."

Therefore, it is to be understood that the nature of liturgical spirituality is based at least on the following apophthegms:

1. The liturgy is the source of every Christian Life

Every spiritual life grows to maturity in "contact" with Christ, by virtue of the Holy Spirit. That is to say, *fit per actionem liturgicam, actione liturgica, una cum actione liturgica* in an objective and real manner and is fulfilled *in, per, cum liturgia; Vita et Mysterium.*

2. The liturgy is the summit of every spiritual life

The ultimate goal of every life is the glory of God, and that of the spiritual life is the growth of a Christian to perfection by means of the sanctifying grace and acting as Christian corresponding to the Christian virtues, mainly in charity that is nourished and fostered by the liturgical actions.

3. It is, therefore, comprehensible that liturgical spirituality is grafted on the *actio Christi, in Ecclesia, virtute Spiritus sancti,* in such a way that the *actio Ecclesiae, in Christo, per Spiritum Sanctum* is postulated in such a manner that the history of salvation, the "oeconomia salvifica", the "mysterium" are realized in life by means of every faithful, being a priestly and prophetic life, sumerized: cultic-liturgical life.

It could be said that the definition of liturgy would bring us to assert the liturgy as the spirituality of the Church, indispensable to it. In extreme case the definitions of liturgy and liturgical spirituality can be combined and so become interchangeable. This should cause no amazement: it treats of the life and the vitality of the people of God.

It follows that:

- liturgical spirituality is not exhausted when participated in a single liturgical action;

- in addition to the liturgical action, liturgical spirituality is present in the life of the faithful;

- an intensive spiritual life cannot be obtained without an explicit or at least understood reference to liturgical-sacramental actions;

- the more a spirituality, among the many spiritualities found in the Church, is closer to liturgical spirituality in its style, method and concrete forms, the more endures in time, long lasting and easier to be lived;

At this point a whole course of fundamental liturgical spirituality could be inserted, followed by courses on concrete manifestations of the liturgico-sacramentarian spirituality.

What has been exposed above is sufficient to recognize the practical success obtained by proceding and arriving at the nature of liturgical spirituality some of the characteristics and prerogatives with which it is adorned.

2.3.2. The Characteristics and Dimensions of Liturgical Spirituality.

To be able to give at least a sketch of the characteristics and dimensions of liturgical spirituality, that is, to respond to the question *quomodo sit,* I think its worth mentioning each part of the double big chapter enclosed in the tittle of the paragraph.

2.3.2.1. The Characteristics or Properties of Liturgical Spirituality

The list of the characteristics of liturgical spirituality given by Brasò in the above mentioned volume[23] is known to all. In the same way Vagaggini, in his noted work cited above, lays down in an eloquent way the salient features of liturgy in relation to spirituality.[24] Other colleagues such as Neunheuser[25], Marsili[26], etc.; in their writings and class notes synthesize them with more or less similar lists. Also I have a set of typed notes for use of the students prepared in 1975-76, drawn in a nutshell the very same matters:

---

[23] Cfr. G.M. BRASO op.cit., pp.101-181.

[24] Cfr. C. VAGAGGINI, *Il senso teologico della liturgia. Saggio di liturgia teologica generale,* Roma 1965, 611-695, especially 624 ff.

[25] See B. NEUNHEUSER, "Spiritualità liturgica", in *NDL* 1325-1435.

[26] See the notes of some of the works of S. MARSILI, collected and edited by M. ALBERTA, *I segni del Mistero di Cristo. Teologia liturgica dei sacramenti,* Roma 1987, especially 505-516.

1) Theological characteristics: among which I have underlined that liturgical spirituality is oriented to the Father, in Christ supreme and eternal Priest by virtue of a very special pneumatological dimension (= a Patre, in Christo Iesu, virtute Spiritus Sancti, ad Patrem).

2) Historico-salvific characteristics: for this I have given attention to liturgical spirituality which is *biblical* (vitalizes the contents of the history of salvation present in the Sacred Scripture), *ecclesial* (because it is the Church, the people of God, that actualizes the history of salvation, "per, in, cum liturgia") and therefore communitarian; at the same time the spirituality is paschal (it is, in fact, in the paschal mystery that the "summa historiae salutis" is realized), and therefore it is sacramentarian (it is in the sacraments, with their dynamism, that the history of salvation is realised). It is comprehensible how liturgical spirituality is mystic in the correct meaning of the adjective (of, in, with the "mysterium").

And given that the Eucharist is *"Sacramentum maxime spiritualitatis"* (Dionisio Cartusiano), and *"Summa omnium carismatum"* (Exposition of the ancient Gallican liturgy) has outlined how the liturgical spirituality is eminently eucharistic.

3) Dynamic-operative characteristics: not in the sense that the early ones were static or passive, but in as much as these render it easier to see how Christian behaviour (life), permeated and imbued by liturgical spirituality, may be an operational dynamic life. Among these characteristics I insist mentioning: cyclicality, objectivity and totality. And in another context, but always related to this sector quoting what others had dealt with, I point out the unifying, pedagogical, eschatological and universal dimensions proper to liturgical spirituality.

It is evident that an exhaustive enquiry into the prerogatives of liturgical spirituality as *reality and life* of Christianity would render it easier to provide an adequate answer to the "quomodo sit".

Still, I think it would be useful to pursue in another way, especially in relation to the fact that liturgical spirituality can be considered as a science.

2.3.2.2. The Dimensions of Liturgical Spirituality as a "Science"

Among the series of issues mentioned previously in this presentation, we retrieve spirituality as science or as a theological discipline. The same question can be asked about liturgical spirituality. Without doubt such a question is directly related to the inquiry whether "spirituality" is, and in what manner, a theological discipline.

It is certain that at this point difficulties that were indicated above rise again; and here I define it in another form: is liturgy an activity of the spiritual sphere, and how could we crystallize a method of study that restrains the "spirit" in typical categories? But, it would be certain that liturgical spirituality as a science should be along the line of study of the particular lives of those persons made faithful and united in Christ-Church, by the power of the Holy Spirit. The object conditions the method, and the very finality of a discipline would be in direct relation with the object itself.

Yet another path can be pursued:

a) to become aware that one can deal with the fundamental questions proper to the discipline "liturgical spirituality", and then particular questions distinguishing the liturgical East from the liturgical West and the particular manifestations of the liturgy (sacraments, liturgical year, liturgy of the hours, eucology, etc.);

b) to become aware that more sciences would be involved for the comprehension of the reality "liturgy". As a consequence, the same liturgical spirituality would benefit from some co-ordinates deriving from other sources of knowledge, without

appearing neither as a syncretistic or eclectic discipline, nor as a tasteless blend of the best coming from other disciplines.

Now, keeping in mind what has been said above about the definition of liturgy and always remembering that such a definition has direct incidence on liturgical spirituality, one has to take into account that in the ambit of the discipline "liturgical spirituality" involves other sciences that study:

- the liturgy as *Mysterium (mystery):* such as biblical theology, dogmatic theology, liturgical theology, etc.

- the liturgy as *Actio (action):* such as the theology of liturgical celebrations, the history of liturgy (in the meaning of what has been said above), comparative liturgico-sacramental theology, etc.

- the liturgy as *Vita (life):* such as liturgical ministry, catechesis and generally the anthropological sciences applied to the Christian - liturgical - vital reality.

From all these follows that liturgical spirituality as discipline or science can benefit from the sources of specific study (diverse from each one of the three levels mentioned above) having recourse to a diversified but convergent method.

In other words, as theological science or discipline, liturgical spirituality would be placed at the end of the "curriculum studiorum" of theology as a synthesis, a vital and vitalizing concretisation of the contents of other disciplines and as their vivifying and actively apostolic comprehension.

Obviously, the characteristics and dimensions of liturgical spirituality could be developed into two volumes, as many are their implications.

2.4. For a Descriptive Definition of Spirituality in View of that of Liturgy.

After what has been expressed so far, I think it benefit to go to the following principles that I retain valid in view of a

definition of "spirituality" and in the interest of "liturgical spirituality."

2.4.1. Fundamental Principles

I) If spirituality is a Christian experience (whether reflectively understood or not) it does not exist outside liturgy or alongside of it. In fact, it is the history of salvation in continuous actualization in the celebration for the life of the faithful, which, in its turn, culminates in celebration so that salvation may not be in vain. Every faithful "makes and realizes" the Christian experience by means of the liturgy.

2) If Christian experience is the assumption of the salvation event present in the faithful, it is "fusible" with the liturgy-life, meaning for liturgy-life whatever comes to the Christian and is present in the Christian from the liturgical celebration or from the orientation towards it. Though the celebration does not exhaust the reality of "liturgy", still its importance in the life of the faithful can be understood. In other words, salvation events, Christian experience and liturgy are inseparable.

3) If liturgy is not different from the mystery of Christ acting in the life of the faithful, then Christian spirituality does not convey properly and solely an experience, but, "sic et simpliciter" "liturgy-life" and that is, the life of the faithful in as much as it is a life of worship in spirit and truth.

Spirituality could be defined by having recourse to experience in spirit and truth, by reason of worship. But the experience mentioned in the present context is shared by him who finds himself in Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit, even if he is not capable of "experiri".

4) As in theory, it is erroneous to think about liturgy only as celebration, and it is equally mistaken interpreting spirituality merely as experience; in the same way, in the

practical field, it is false to introduce a separation between liturgy and Christian spirituality;

Hence the necessity to go through the history of Christianity (eastern and western, mainly the latter), in order to explain well the following facts:

a) the progressive separation between life of Christians and the reality of Christianity, even before investigating the separation between celebration and life;

b) the progressive breach between the reality "liturgy" and the catechesis-formation of the different generations of faithful or groups.

c) the profound loss of specific Christian context while at the same time methodology has been enriched, while means have blossomed in order to sustain spiritual life. This is however experiential manifestation of faith, such as: various devotions, techniques, schools, etc.

Has this not been a qualitative fall, which has impoverished, distracted and decodified the clear and simple nucleus of the liturgy willed by Christ and left to the Church for the good of the faithful, and for renewing the "face" of the earth?

2.4.2. Orientations for Further Enrichment

If one were not to forget that the liturgy is life (and not only mystery and celebration) and that liturgical spirituality is living, vital, vitalizing spiritulality, one should agree that the rediscovery of liturgy, etc., is in continuous becoming by the very same nature of the realities that are involved within.

If one were to invest oneself with the theme considered so far, also with the following orientations, then one might understand how far one has still to travel before arriving at something less "shady".

I) The theologico-liturgical orientation strengthens the presence of the Mystery in the life of the faithful of which he

partakes by means of the celebration filtered by the liturgical modalities of the memorial (=anamnesis), of the participation (methexis), of the presence of the Spirit invoked (epiclesis), and of its action (paraclesis), having as its goal the return to the Father (anaclesis). With the help of this orientation the categories of Christian "spirituality-existence-experience" are found again in the spirituality of the "liturgy" of the life of worship in Spirit and in Truth.

It is certain that I also say *no* to "panliturgism", condemned by Sacrosanctum Concilium, 9. But knowing that every faithful, from the moment of his baptism, shares in *Cristo-leitourgos,* then one could say *yes* to "pan-en-liturgism". This makes us understand that the " liturgy of the life of worship" is a fulcrum on which Christian spirituality rests.

2) The Trinitarian orientation of the reality "liturgy", is the spiritual driving force of the well known apophthegm *a Patre, in Filio, virtute Spiritus Sancti, ad Patrem* with all that is vitally enclosed within. If the human person is created out of love, gifted with freedom to render glory to God, that is, created in the image and likeness of God "Love-Freedom-Glory", then the *in Filio* of the above quoted apophthegm, invigorates the life of the human person with an implicit vocation for the non-Christian, and for the faithful with an explicit vocation to live spiritually the vitality of being "in Filio" projected to the Father. Being *in Filio* is the existential liturgy participated even by the infants, just as by one who is mentally retarded or in coma, etc. This Trinitarian orientation helps us understand and strengthen the spiritual vitality of liturgy.

3) The ecclesial orientation would produce the implications of spirituality in the Church, such as, liturgical spirituality. Consequently the faithful, *in Ecclesia, una cum Ecclesia, per Ecclesiam, pro Ecclesia,* behave because they share in the spirituality of the royal, prophetic and priestly people, that

is the liturgical spirituality: spirituality which the Church is the depository par excellence.

4) The anthropological orientation helps us to understand how the *anthropos,* once being *fidelis,* is in a position of continuous growth *in Christo* (the way of being) and *in Christum* (the way of becoming) till reaching the goal, "maturity in Christ" according to Eph. 4,13.

This orientation opens new outlooks thus enables oneself to understand that liturgical spirituality is the soul of day-to-day spirituality (*alias* Christian existence) sanctified (cfr. the "descending" dimension of liturgy) in an existential involvement (cfr. the binding or "obligatory" dimension of liturgy) for the worship (cfr. "ascending" dimension of liturgy).

5) The auxological orientation (auxesis = growth), which is intimately united to the preceding, is that which would help us to continuously overcome partial visions opting those which are more unifying, which crumble all dividing barriers such as ethnical, cultural, social, in the name of Christian agape. Besides, when the auxological orientation comes into contact with the limits of diverse entities in a theoretical or practical position, it orientates decisively towards overcoming them in the name of a unifying vision which, by its nature is inherent in liturgical spirituality.

On the other hand it is really this orientation that in union with others will enable studying another problem croping up in theological scholarship, and connected with the rediscovery in the continuous becoming of the liturgy. It deals with the question whether spirituality should be treated as theology or not.

Here one might recall a simple reasoning, not to resolve the problem but eventually to emphasize it: "as the spirituality in general is connected with existence, so Christian spirituality is in relation with the Christian existence". In spiritual theology this

finds a scientific reflection. So spiritual theology does not compromise the formal unity of theology.

Now, both Christian spirituality and spiritual theology are activities of the Church whose apex (culmen) is found in liturgy. Therefore, spiritual theology recognise liturgy as its crown, and "liturgical spiritual theology" in liturgical spirituality.

Conclusion

It is certain that the alpha and omega of liturgical spirituality is to vivify the spirit, the soul and the life of the faithful according to the paths of grace according to divine life indwelling in the personhood of the faithful by reason of and for the purpose of giving glory to the divine Persons. It draws our attention that liturgy: mystery-action-life, is first of all an event in the spiritual order. Disregarding liturgy, globally accepted as a *sacramentum fidei,* is unexpected to the faith itself.[27] Rather, "fides christiana quo fit certior, eo est utilior"[28]; for this reason the more one lives in harmony with liturgical spirituality, the more one can understand both the "liturgy-life" and the vitality of the liturgy. And the more one perceives these realities, the more easily one participates in the mysteries of salvation, and that submit oneself in a position to thrive to maturity in Christ.[29] The configuration and conformation to Christ "Christifies" the faithful more and more, but always by the power of the Holy Spirit, the Sanctifier. The process of Christification is correlated to that of pneuma-configuration. In fact, every faithful, immersed in Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit is "Christified" and immersed in the Spirit by the power of Christ is

---

[27] See the expression of St Augustine: "Sacramentum fidei, fides est", Epistola 98, 9, in *Patrologia Latina 33, 364;* or *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum,* 34, 2, 531.

[28] See ALGERO DI LODI, *De Sacramenti* s I, 12, *Patrologia Latina* 180, 177.

[29] Cfr. Eph. 4,13.

"Spiritualized". Consequently, liturgical spirituality is aimed at making each and every faithful, a living ostensorium of the living God, among living human beings, in order to draw from life and from the whole cosmos itself a continuous doxology to the Father, to the Son and to the Holy Spirit, as it was in the beginning, now and for ever.

CHURCH *SUI IURIS*, ETHOS AND MORAL THEOLOGY

Basilio Petrà

Since attention to the ethos as a dimension of moral reflection has been diffused in theology,[1] there have not been lacking studies or contributions on the relationship between moral theology and ethos. However this relationship has been mostly investigated in general terms taking into consideration the concrete ethos of a culture or a social area or a profession, or else the biblical ethos, the sacramental ethos etc.; least attention has been given to that which can properly signify the contribution of a Church *sui iuris*, with regard to ethos and moral theology.

This lacuna is probably due to the fact that the ethical research was led forward almost exclusively by the theology of the latin tradition and therefore within an ecclesial space in which the presence of Rome has determined wide and profound liturgical and cultural unitariness.

It is not casual, from such a point of view, that in the present theologico-magisterial language[2] a distinction is made

---

[1] W.KLUXEN, *Ethik des Ethos*, Freiburg-München, 1974; B.STÖCKLE, "Ethos" in *Dizionario di etica cristiana*, directed by B. Stöckle, Italian edition by T.Goffi, Assisi, 1978, 138-143; F.BÖCKLE, *Morale fondamentale*, Brescia, 1979, 233-236 in particular.

[2] For the clarification of terms"particular Church" and "local Church", starting from LG,13 and CD,11, cfr. H. J. SCHULZ, "Ortskirche und Gesamtkirche; Primat, Kollegialität und Synodalität" in *Eglise locale et Eglise universelle*, Chambesy-Geneve, 1981 (Les Études Théologiques de Chambesy, 1), 177-197, in particular 177-182 where we see the three significances of the "local Church", elucidated by the well known note 8 of the document *La collaboration oecuménique au plan régional et au plan national et au plan local* (22 février 1975) of the Secretariate for the Unity of Christians (EV, 5, 1111-1114).

between the universal Church and particular Churches, identifying these latter, on the basis of *Christus Dominus* no. 11, with dioceses (cfr. CIC can. 368). The rest (provinces, ecclesiastical regions, metropolis, particular councils and episcopal conferences) is reduced to particular Churches as it comes within that which the CIC calls exactly *Ecclesiarum particularium coetus*[3] and does not seem to have a clear and intrinsic theological value.

Things are not like this in the case of oriental tradition; between the eparchies or dioceses[4] and the universal Church there exist intermediary structures[5] and these are identified with Churches *sui iuris*.[6] These, as we will see, are well more than an amalgamation of particular Churches. They are peculiar incarnations of the universal Church, its determinate forms. If the Church as some orthodox theologians note, is a form or modality of existence,[7] then the Churches *sui iuris* are its distinct plasmations or forms and not its simple concretizations. As a consequence they cannot but have a significance in relation to

---

[3] CIC, Liber secundus, Pars secunda, Sectio secunda, Titulus secundus, cc. 431-459.

[4] The identification of the eparchy and particular Church is clearly seen in CCEO, can.177 § 1.

[5] P.PALLATH, *The Synod of Bishops of Catholic Oriental Churches*, Rome, 1994, 50-51.

[6] The Latin term calls to mind the Orthodox terms of "autocephalous Churches" and autonomous Churches. The ecclesiological constitution of "autocephalous Churches" is not yet fully clear in the Orthodoxy, even if the common tendency is to identify local Church and autocephalous Church. Cfr V.PHEIDAS, "L'Eglise Locale- autocephale ou autonome- en communion avec les autres Eglises. Autocephalie et communion" in *Eglise locale et Eglise universelle*, cit., 141-150; J.ZIZIOULAS, "L'église locale dans une perspective eucharistique" in *L'être ecclésial*, Genève, 1981, 181-194.

[7] This is a particularly vital theme in the contemporary Orthodox theology: cfr. B.PETRÀ, "Cristo salvatore della verità personale dell'uomo nella riflessione ortodossa contemporanea" in *La coscienza morale oggi. Omaggio al prof. Domenico Capone*, Roma, 1987, 373-405.

ethos and, if in relation to ethos, also in relation to moral theology.

The object of this short study is to investigate the significance for ethos and moral theology constituted by the existence of Churches, not simply particular but *sui iuris* in the richest sense of CCEO.

For this purpose we will proceed thus. First of all, we will see what is a Church *sui iuris*; secondly its relationship with ethos; and lastly its relatioship through ethos, with the moral theological consciousness.

1. Rites and Churches *Sui Iuris*[8]

The basic texts to which we will make reference in this paragraph are offered by canons 27 and 28 of the recent CCEO.

Canon 27 says that a Church *sui iuris* is a *coetus christifidelium hierarchia ad normam iuris iunctus,* recognized as such *expresse vel tacite* by the supreme authority of the Church.

The type of relationship that exists between "rite", "Church *sui iuris*" and "traditions" is most important and that is described by canon 28 as follows:

> §1. Ritus est patrimonium liturgicum, theologicum, spirituale et disciplinare cultura ac rerum adiunctis historiae populorum distinctum, quod modo fidei vivendae uniuscuiusque Ecclesiae *sui iuris* proprio exprimitur.
>
> §2. Ritus de quibus in Codice agitur, sunt, nisi aliud constat, illi, qui oriuntur ex traditionibus Alexandrina, Antiochena, Armena, Chaldaea et Constantinopolitana.[9]

We may make some annotations:

---

[8] P.PALLATH, *The Synod of Bishops,* cit.; *Catholic Eastern Churches: Heritage and Identity*, Paul Pallath ed., Rome, 1994.

[9] Cf. OE,3: EV,1,459: "Huiusmodi particulares Ecclesiae, tum Orientis tum Occidentis, licet ritibus, ut aiunt, nempe liturgia, ecclesiastica disciplina et patrimonio spirituali partim inter se differant, aequali tamen modo concreduntur pastorali guberno Romani Pontificis etc...".

* Rite is well more than the rituals or cult, even if it includes them: it is the faith of a concrete community experienced, celebrated, "theologized" or rather expressed in self conscious form.

* It is distinct on the basis of the culture and history of the people and is made concretely present through its own manner of living the faith by each Church *sui iuris*.

* Among the oriental Churches all the rites are referable to the five traditions in such a way that the various Churches *sui iuris* belonging to the same tradition have a fundamental liturgical, theological, spiritual and disciplinary communality.

According to J. Madey "today rite designates the specific form of tradition as it is observed by an autonomous church [Ecclesia *sui iuris]*. So the Alexandrian, Antiochean, Armenian, Chaldean and Constantinopolitan (Byzantine) traditions are specified in various rites". According to him this does not signify that there cannot be "more autonomous churches than rites, because certain autonomous churches are the outcome of the same traditions and have the largest number of things in common, inherited from the past, as e.g. the Ukrainian, Ruthenian, Slovak, Križevci Byzantine churches".[10] It may be so, from the moment that the relationship between rite and Church is not of simple identification.[11] But what is really important is that no rite exists abstractly, it is always a reality which manifests itself concretely in one or more Churches *sui iuris* and exists therefore in as much as it is "individualised" in some Churches *sui iuris*.[12]

Every Church *sui iuris*, however, is born of an encounter, a union. On the one hand we see the specificity of the culture of a people, an element well emphasised by canon 28 ("cultura ac

---

[10] J.MADEY, "Catholic Oriental Churches- A General Introduction" in *Catholic Eastern Churches*, cit., 8-23, here 10.

[11] P.PALLATH, *The Synod of Bishops of Catholic Oriental Churches*, Rome, 1994, 51-54.

[12] *Ibidem*, 53: "What gives a Church its distinctive identity and individuality is its rite, namely its specific liturgical, theological, spiritual and disciplinary patrimony".

rerum adiunctis historiae populorum"); on the other hand the enrichment and growth brought by the announcement of the gospel through a determinate tradition in a particular time and space.

This point is of great importance; however it will appear still more important after some general considerations on the relationship between culture and religion, culture and Church, culture and Church *sui iuris.*

2. Culture, Church and Churches *Sui Iuris*

Culture is an extremely complex reality; it has peculiar connotations according to various philosophical traditions and undergoes diverse determinations according to the specificity of every science.[13] In what sense does CCEO canon 28 use the concept of culture? It is very difficult to determine; but since CCEO is considered as "novum complementum magisterii a concilio Vaticano II propositi"[14], it is probable that the conciliar idea of culture is presupposed and as it is noted the idea is particularly expressed in *Gaudium et Spes*, No. 53.

According to *Gaudium et Spes,* No. 53 a distinction has to be made between two senses of culture. First of all it has a "sensus generalis" or more properly an anthropological sense. In such sense "culture" indicates:

> everything by which we perfect and develop our many spiritual and physical endowments; applying ourselves through knowledge and effort to bring the earth within our power; developing ways of behaving and institutions, we make life in society more human, whether in the family or in the civil sphere as a whole; in the course of time we express, share and preserve in our works great spiritual experiences and aspirations to contribute to the progress of many people, even of the whole human race.

---

[13] Cfr. the best voice of P.ROSSI, "Cultura" in *Enciclopedia del Nocevento*, I, Roma, 1975, 1143-1157.

[14] Apostolic Constitution *Sacri canones*, 18 ottobre 1990: EV, 12, 520.

Secondly culture has a sociological and ethnological connotation. In this sense "one can talk of a plurality of cultures. The variety of ways in which objects are utilised, labour is applied, the self is expressed, religion is practised, customary ways of behaving take shape, laws and juridical institutions are established, the sciences and arts develop, and beauty is pursued, all give rise to different conditions of life in common, and different expressions in the structuring of life's resources. In this way the handing of customs becomes an inheritance peculiar to each human community, and an identifiable historical environment is established to receive people of every race and age and to provide them with the resources to cultivate their human and social life".

The two conciliar senses of culture are essential in order to understand well the relationship between culture and Church. Therefore we will deal with them further.

The first points out the constitutive and generative dimensions of culture starting from the proper character of man, "to be the producer of culture". Therefore, culture appears subsequently as the work of the self perfection of man; as the humanization of the cosmos; as the humanization of the society; as the transmission of the "memory" of man. In other words, culture emerges in coincidence with the whole progress of human generations towards the always greater realization of man and the edification of a more and more adequate human abode. It is culture in its active and "generative" aspect, considered as the explanation itself of the self plasmatic and cosmo-plasmatic capacity of man.

The second sense refers to the product or result of the plasmatic activity of man, that is, to all those realities that assume concrete form in history, and constitute the "human" environment of man, the home made by man with his own hands.

In the horizon of this comprehension of culture, a fact becomes evident: there is not only one linear journey of humanization, there are many journeys. They meet, converge or diverge, dilate in time or die, leaving some traces which flow into

journeys originating from other places. The culture concretely exists as *cultures* and every culture, in varied, permanent and vital exchange with others, is in relationship with the human groups and their diversity.

The religious form of every human group is part of its cultural specificity.

Gaudium et Spes, no. 53, as we have seen, recognizes this aspect of specific relationship of religion to a culture but renders it explicit only when it refers to the second sense of culture. Perhaps it does not emphasize sufficiently another most important aspect of religion: religion expresses symbolically or narratively the world of values and the *Weltanschauung* of every culture to which it belongs, or indeed tends to furnish its metahistorical foundation, to orientate it towards its ultimate meaning and transmit it by building up the historic continuity of the identity of a people.[15]

Doing that, it forms moral attitudes and offers behavioural models with authority. All these happen especially through the religious cult: the cult is the "abode" in which is experimented the sense, the value, and the continuity of culture. It is true that all the cultures are not "religious"; all the cultures however necessitate symbolization and cult, in whatever manner it may be manifested, "religious" or "non religious".

The pontifical magisterium of John Paul II appears to be particularly sensible to this intimate relationship between culture, people, and religion. He has accentuated many times how Christianity may be inserted in the culture of the peoples, generating specific forms of Christianity. According to him this is particularly visible in the evangelization of the Slavic people by the effort of the brothers Cyril and Methodius, who thus offer even today a valid model of inculturation of the Gospel: "The work of evangelization which they carried out -- as pioneers in the territory inhabited by Slav peoples -- contains both a model

---

[15] Cfr. C.GEERTZ, "La religione come sistema culturale" in *La religione oggi,* edited by D.R.Cutler, Milano, 1972 [ed. or. Boston:Mass., 1968], 9-61, in particular p. 13.

of what today is called "inculturation" -- the incarnation of the Gospel in autoctonous cultures -- and also the introduction of these cultures into the life of the Church" (SA 21). "The two brothers not only carried out their mission with full respect for the culture already existing among the Slav peoples, but together with religion they eminently and unceasingly promoted and extended that culture" (SA 26).

This dynamics of historic "inculturation" of Christianity, which must continue even today with respect to young Churches (Rmis 52-54), does not contrast at all with the catholicity of the Church, but is rather its realization, since "for full catholicity, every nation, every culture has its own part to play in the universal plan of salvation" (SA 27) provided that it does not remain closed in on itself, but opens itself to the communion of Churches.[16]

In this light rites, according to the understanding offered by CCEO, canon 28 § 1, manifest themselves as those great symbolic spaces, both cognitive and existential, in which the cultures of the peoples enriched by the announcement of Christ - at a certain moment of their history - have given and are continually giving to themselves Christian forms and expressiveness without loosing their own identity but growing towards an always greater humanity and truth. "The evangelization too plays a role in the culture of the various nations, sustaining culture in its progress towards the truth, and assisting in the work of its purification and enrichment" (CA 50). It is through such "spaces" that the peoples with their own cultures have become Churches *sui iuris*.

The rites, from such a point of view, are a "Christian" sign of a culture and a "cultural" sign of Christianity. On the one hand they show the Christian self consciousness of a culture, its vision of the world and its horizon of values and ideals, on the other hand they manifest the cultural particularity of the

---

16 The two guiding principles of a true inculturation may be remembered: "the compatibility with the Gospel and the communion with the universal Church" (FC,10; Rmis, 54).

Christian self consciousness: sounds, colours, things, images, concepts and the proper behaviours of a culture become the means and partly the categories of perception and expression of the unique Christian experience of salvation.

The rites remain thus between particularity and universality, in a tension and permanent dialectics, which make their fecundity and their vitality itself in history. As streams of life experienced, expressed, celebrated - in fact - they expand in time safeguarding their own identity in the historico-social variations in the presence of the provocations of changing times, receiving and rejecting, forming and adapting themselves, as all living beings.

3. Churches *Sui Iuris* and Ethos

From what we have seen till now, we can already draw numerous elements to illuminate the complex relationship between Church *sui iuris* and ethos.

The complexity has one of its primary roots in the semantic richness of a term such as ethos, used in different sciences with different formal approaches. Considered sociologically, it tends to coincide with the term culture. Some times, it is identified with moral custom, empirically ascertained; at other times still, it indicates the anthropological perceptions or the spiritual attitudes dominant in particular human groups.

Considered in the moral perspective it assumes two fundamental lines of significance.

The first significance is well expressed by the definition of B. Stöckle:

> Ethos signifies in general the historical and concrete structure of human existence ethically determined: the whole complex of normative moral conscience, the perspectives and dominant assiological convictions; the modes and models of behaviour in force; in one word: the praxis of moral life endowed with binding value.[17]

---

[17] B.STÖCKLE, "Ethos" in *Dizionario di etica cristiana*, edited by B. Stöckle, Italian edition by T.Goffi, Assisi, 1978, 138.

In this light the term would indicate those "modes" of valuing and acting that are "simply binding" to the members of a particular human group at a determinate time; "modes" not necessarily respected and practised, but in every case considered as obliging, that is, as morally strong in view of the individual conscience of the members of the group.

The second line of significance, instead, indicates by ethos "the mode of living", the "the mode of being in the world" which should correspond to a determinate ontological constitution of man. This line of thought has received a fundamental impulse from M. Heidegger. It has been Heidegger, in fact, that in the *Letter on Humanism,* has recalled attention to the etymological significance of the word ethos indicating exactly according to its use in Homer and Herodotus, the place of residence and stability, the home.[18] This recall has been received in a particular way by some contemporary orthodox theologians.[19]

The two lines of thought are not divergent; but in the Christian experience they are profoundly united. On the one hand, the ethos as the "mode of living" corresponding to the salvation brought by Christ has become the principle of discernment with respect to the preceding ethos (binding moral praxis), forming the new ethos of the peoples evangelized. On the other hand the ethos as "binding moral praxis" has formed

---

[18] Cfr. M.HEIDEGGER, *Lettera sull'umanesimo*, Torino, 1975, 123 where it is commented the famous fragment 119 Diels-Kranz (91 Diano) of Heraclitus on *êthos* as *daimôn* of man. The Heideggerian interpretation, however, does not agree with that of many philologists: cfr.Heraclitus, *I frammenti e le testimonianze*, critical text and translation of Carlo Diano, Commentary of Carlo Diano e Giuseppe Serra, Milano, 1993, 42,178-179. It does not agree even with that of S.S.AVERINCEV, *Atene e Gerusalemme. Contrapposizione e incontro di due principi creativi*, Roma, 1994, 25: "according to the expression of Heraclitus, the nature of man is his *daemon*, in other words, his *destiny*".

[19] B.PETRÀ, *Tra cielo e terra. Introduzione alla teologia morale ortodossa contemporanea*, Bologna, 1992, 59-60.

the sensibility and the language typical to every people in the appropriation of Christian experience in its moral aspects.

The evangelized peoples continue to be the same peoples but by now baptized: their ethos becomes an ethos immersed in the baptismal waters. And as the liturgical use gives always new significance and capacity to water, so the reception of the Gospel gives novelty to a people that with its culture comes from far away.

In the oriental Churches the ethos of the Christian novelty has brought about its fruitful union with the popular ethos, particularly at the time of the Fathers, seeing its eminent place of symbolic transcription and formative efficacy as a whole in the liturgical celebration. The liturgy has become in the centuries, thus, among the oriental Christian peoples the plasma and the unifying factor of the popular experience:[20] the feasts, the chants, the colours, the values, the personalities, and the experiences of liturgy have become the channels of the transformation of popular culture from the pre-Christian to the Christian era without the dissolution of continuity.

It is necessary to recognize that till now much attention has not been given to this "ethical" dimension of the specificity of a Church *sui iuris.*

And yet the canon 28, § 1 attributes to a similar Church a "proprius modus fidei vivendae" in which the rite expresses itself concretely. Now the ethos indicates precisely the dimension of faith experience, the manner of living the proper faith of a people and of their Church; a manner of living that hangs between universality and particularity, cultural continuity and perennial Christian novelty.

The particularization of rite in the concrete expression of a Church *sui iuris* becomes, in such a way, already according to

---

[20] Cfr. J.CHALASSERY, *The Spiritual Life of the St.Thomas Christians (Marthomakristyanikal)* in *Catholic Eastern Churches: Heritage and Identity*, cit., 295: "The liturgy provides them the social and religious matrices on which all the strands of their life may be woven into an organic whole".

CCEO, the key of its ethos, the matrix that constantly generates and recapitulates it. In order to know that which makes a Church different from others, constituting its identity within the communion of Churches and defining the real content of its particular contribution to the universal Church, it is necessary to examine thoroughly this living ethos and to render its individualizing characters explicit as much at the level of values so at the level of behaviour.

It is still a work at the embryo stage with regard to the catholic communion of Churches; the richness of all the peoples must become a conscious contribution to the Kingdom.[21] Therefore, it is a work to be promoted and intensified; every Church and every people that are realized in it *Christianly* must perceive the responsibility regarding the patrimony entrusted to them, of which they live and in which they sink their roots.

One may think of that which can signify the deepening of the proper ethos of every Church as much in the various circumstances of daily life (work, marriage, family, social organization, education, defence, etc.) as in the ambit of strictly ecclesial life (canons, sacraments, spirituality, theology), when its contents and significance may be made explicit and its richness may be illuminated for a universal Church that wishes to carry to Christ the preciousness and diverse beauty of all the peoples.

If the phenomenon of the oriental Churches in the history of Catholicism is considered, it is necessary to recognize that the explanation of ethos does not appear always as an easy task. Sometimes a reassumption of identity will be necessary that may integrate into a unity the various moments of the history of a culture in some way violated, harmonizing again the fragments of the ethos and reconstructing its continuity in time. It is a complex and laborious process which needs time and much thinking.

Something similar is already being realized in the ambit of the Syro-Malabar Church beginning from the efforts of

---

[21] Cfr. the splendid text of LG,13.

Paremmakkal Thomakathanar (1736-1799) and his book *Varthamanappusthakam.*[22] The Syro-Malabar Church in this century has been moving formally towards the recovery of its own socio-cultural identity, its own ethos, centering around that which is called the "Law of Thomas" or *Thomamargam*, the law in whose defence it went as far as the famous *Coonan-Cross* oath of 1653.[23]

It is in this "Law" that the Syro-Malabar Church seems to have her true ethos, that which can renew her identity in the present, and open her to a significant future in the communion of Churches.

"Whatever the precise origin of this expression 'Law of Thomas, -- writes G. Nedungatt --these Christians used to employ it to justify their stand against forced latinization. It resumed the whole of their Christian patrimony of faith, liturgy, Church discipline, customs, usage and laws. It referred to their specific mode of living as a Church community with a spirituality and an identity of its own, distinct from that of the 'Law of Peter' followed by the Latin missionaries. It stood for the whole ethos of their Church life".[24]

---

[22] Cfr. T.PAREMMAKAL, *Varthamanappusthakam*, English translation with notes by P.J.Podipara, Roma, 1971 (OCA,190).

[23] G.NEDUNGATT, "Spirituality of the Syro-Malabar Church", in *East Syrian Spirituality*, edited by A.Thottakara, C.M.I., Rome-Bangalore, 1990, 143-202, in particular 167-170. To such an oath is attributed today a considerable symbolic value and one is more inclined to see its unifying potentiality among all the Christians of St. Thomas more than the immediate reality of separation.

[24] *Ibidem*, 162. Again, in pp.163-164 he emphasizes that also with respect to the Chaldean Church the Christians of St Thomas could maintain their individuality; "The Law of Thomas was...the whole ethos of the life of the Thomaschristians, and not simply the ensembly of their canon law, which but part of a whole embracing their spiritual, ecclesial, liturgical and socio-political life. Their family and social customs and traditions of birth, schooling, marriage, death and so on were not in need of change by their Christian faith. Where possible and useful, their social organization was even carried over into their Church life, as in the *yogam* ... for their liturgical life, while following basically the rites, prayers, and ceremonies prescribed by the

It is not casual that Fr. Nedungatt, starting exactly from the "Law of Thomas", may have tried to elucidate "the individuality of the Syro-Malabar Church",[25] drawing indications from the various aspects of the ethos of the Malabar Church to delineate her proper spirituality. Others have worked and are working in this direction.[26]

Church Sui Iuris, Ethos and Moral Theology - a Conclusion

We have observed that explicit attention to the ethos as the source of identity is still in the initial stage.

Among the various Churches *sui iuris* the Syro-Malabar Church in particular seems to have proceeded in this direction.[27]

---

liturgical books of their Chaldean prelates, they also knew how to strike a style of their own at least in ccertain details....".

[25] *Ibidem*, 164. The terminology of the "individuality" of the Syro-Malabar Church dates back to P.J.PODIPARA, *The Individuality of the Malabar Church*, Palai, 1972. The movement of the recovery of the identity of the Syro-Malabar Church ows to Placid Podipara, more than to any one else: cfr. J.MADEY-G.KANIARAKATH (eds.), *The Church I Love. A Tribute to Rev. Placid Podipara, C.M.I.*, Kottayam, 1984. Of P.PODIPARA one may see : "Hindu in Culture, Christian in religion, Oriental in Worship" in *Ostkirchliche Studien* 8 (1959) 89-104. It is a famous and discussed article. About it, cfr., the considerations of G.NEDUNGATT, *Spirituality of the Syro-Malabar Church*, cit., 190-192, particularly note 54.

[26] Besides the works of P. J. Podipara I limit myself to remember J.AERTHAYIL, *The Spiritual Heritage of the St.Thomas Christians*, Bangalore, 1982 and the interesting essays that occupy the third part of *Catholic Eastern Churches: Heritage and Identity*, cit.: J.PERUMTHOTTAM, "Syro-Malabar Church- A Short Historical Introduction", 231-242; C.PAYNGOT, "Some Particular Elements in the Liturgical Tradition of the St. Thomas Christians", 243-271; J.CHALASSERY, "The Spiritual Life of the St.Thomas Christians (Marthomakristyanikal)", 272-295; J.KOIKAKUDY, "The Particular Canonical Institutions of the Syro-Malabar Church", 296-307.

[27] Attempts in this direction are certainly present also in other Oriental Churches. As far as I know the effort of the Syro-Malankara Church is significant. A serious attempt of reflection on the Malankara ethos and its significance for moral theology is being led forward by Chacko

But it should be observed that also the effort of the Syro-Malabarians to reconstitute the historico-cultural identity of their own Church has not taken into consideration till today the specifically moral significance of ethos itself, that which it implies with regard to action, in the manner of relating actively with themselves, with others and with the cosmos.

Is it an inattention? Perhaps. It is however more probable that it may be a question of "Malabarian reflection" of a conviction that appears to be much diffused in the theology of this century, the opinion that a specific moral theology may be a latin characteristic and not oriental.[28]

As a matter of fact moral theology in the latin model may not belong to the oriental tradition (I speak in singular for convenience) but this does not imply that the Orient may have had little interest for the ethical consequence of the Christian experience or may have despised the use of ethical reason. It should not be forgotten that Thomistic morals are based upon the Aristotelian morality and the Greek Fathers, besides St Augustine; now, the Greek Fathers are the Fathers of the oriental tradition and Aristotle -- especially the Aristotelian logic and in some measure also his moral -- has always had a notable reception in the Byzantine culture. [29]

Aerath. See his book, *Liturgy and Ethos: A Study Based on the Malankara Liturgy of Marriage,* Rome 1995.

[28] Cf. B.GRIFFITHS, *Christ in India. Essays towards a Hindu-Christian Dialogue,* II ed., Bangalore, 1986, 53: "The eastern Church has preserved a way of life and thought, which finds expression in its liturgy, which is quite different from the traditions of the West. It knows nothing of scholastic philosophy and theology, or of moral theology and casuistry. But it is steeped in the tradition of the bible and the Fathers and the ancient symbolic mode of thought".

[29] For the presence of Aristotelianism in the Greek-Christian tradition, in comparison with the Latin tradition and the Russian Christian culture, cfr. the most valuable notes of S.AVERINCEV, "La vocazione della filosofia e l'unità della Chiesa" in *Cristianesimo e cultura in Europa. Memoria, coscienza, progetto. Atti del Simposio presinodale (Vaticano 28-31 ottobre 1991),* Forlç, 1991, 18-24.

That which could be more properly said is that the oriental moral theology has assumed neither the same systematization nor the same amplitude that it has had in the latine tradition owing to a different conception of the relationship between Church and world, a different penitential praxis, a different role of theology and magisterium of the Church, and finally due to the formidable influence exerted on the form of occidental knowledge by the idea of "science".[30]

It is true that the oriental moral knowledge has many times tried to formulate itself in imitation of that of latin; but it has been done not only pseudomorphising itself, it is the language of Florovsky, but also separating itself from the sources of its own ethos, flying in the theologico-philosophical heaven of the models of imitation, excluding rare exceptions. It has remained thus, in so far as "oriental", fundamentally implicit and fragmentary.

But it is not an ineluctable necessity that it may remain always implicit and fragmentary; perhaps it is a question of looking for a method that may not betray the oriental ethos, but all together may constitute a true rational explanation of moral life. Instead of following, as at other times, the occidental traces, trying to give oriental tone to pre-determined rational articulations, there should originate a theology capable of

---

[30] In spite of his excesses, CH.Yannaras is perhaps in the right when he emphasizes that on the one hand the knowledge in the Western tradition is intellectual logical dominion of the object by the subject and in this there is no solution of continuity between the science of scholastics and the modern science; on the other hand knowledge in the eastern tradition is to enter into communion and participation. Cfr.CH.YANNARAS, *Orthodoxia kai Dysê stê neôterê Ellada* (Orthodoxy and the West in Modern Greece), Atene, 1992, 23: "Everything (in the western tradition) is controlled with a totalitarianism which constitutes the theoretical and practical method. The result: a culture or manner of universal living, bound to the polarity between intellectualistic individuo-centrism and a predominant "objectivity" - a culture that reverses the greek terms; not even the least suspicion of the greek "common logos", of the identification between 'to be true" and to be in communion", of the empirico-communal verification of every theory and practice".

manifesting the ethos that nourishes it, through the rational language derived from the culture, either explicating it in its contents or developing from it the normative significance for the life of single persons and of communities in view of the new technological, social and economic challenges.

This rooting of moral theology in the ethos is not to be interpreted as the exaltation of the particular in opposition to the universal (to the catholic), nor as a renunciation of the confrontation and exchange of cultures and traditions: if no man is an island, neither is it a culture, nor a tradition, nor a rite.

The fear of a moral knowledge closed in on itself, having an ethnological value, but not universal, is not a fear deprived of sense.

Something of this kind can occur; but only in the case of a people that lives isolated, deprived of relationship with other humans, or in the case of an instrumental knowledge of a "political" will of isolation, separation and conflict. But it cannot happen if the rooting in the proper ethos signifies simply from the side of the moral theologian the conscious assumption of that historical modality of participating in the life and salvation which constitutes the root of his own *being -living.*

The ethos is not, in fact, a pure contingency, but it is the manner through which life comes and through which the theologian himself can live. For every human being, in particular for every Christian, the universality of his being reaches him trough the particularity of his culture, of his ethos; on the other hand, it is only through the particularity of his own ethos that every human being can open himself to the universal, provided that he may live his particularity as the path towards the universal horizon of the human event.

The emergence, however, of a moral theology rooted in the ethos of a Church *sui iuris* and conscious of the duty of being the rational illumination of the experience of one's own Church for a more rich communion of the Churches, requires intellectually equipped persons, namely experts of philosophy (philosophies) and theology (theologies). But first of all, it

requires persons steeped in the ecclesial experience, and affectionate researchers of the sources of ethos (the liturgy, theology, spirituality, canonical organization, the popular culture, arts etc.) at the service of the "exchange of gifts" among the Churches, because the unity prepared by God for his people is the immensely rich harmony of different beings, created the one for the others.

LITURGICAL NORMS IN THE CODE OF CANONS OF THE EASTERN CHURCHES

Dimitri Salachas

Theology, liturgy and canon law constitute an inseparable triptych of sacred sciences, and are so inter-related among themselves that they are to be treated together in order to penetrate profoundly, in the light of faith, the doctrine of the Church derived from the divine revelation and sacred Tradition. All these three theological disciplines are at the service of faith and grace, since they help the Christian faithful to profess, celebrate and live the faith in the world and in the Church, mystery of communion. Theology is the necessary source of liturgy and canon law. But also the articles of faith, theological doctrine, as well as canonical discipline are illustrated in the divine worship, especially in the sacraments. Thus liturgy is the necessary source of doctrine and true Christian spirit.

The *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches* (CCEO) confirms and preserves the liturgical patrimony of the Eastern Churches. The liturgical tradition is part of the *ritus* of every *sui iuris* Church, understood in the sense of canon 28 § 1, that is, as "the heritage made up of liturgy, theology, spirituality, and discipline, a heritage that is differentiated by the culture and the circumstances of the history of peoples and which is expressed by each Church *sui iuris* in its own manner of living the faith". It deals with the various rites that have originated from the great Constantinopolitan, Alexandrian, Antiochean, Armenian and Chaldean traditions. In the rites of the Oriental Churches, as the heritage of the universal Church of Christ, shines forth the tradition coming from the Apostles through the Fathers, and which in its variety affirms the divine unity of the Catholic faith. Every *sui iuris* Church witnesses, professes, lives and celebrates the unique faith of Christ in its rite. In this sense Christian faithful are not juridically enrolled in a rite, but in a *sui iuris*

Church which has its own rite. The rite, though very important, does not constitute a juridical element of a *sui iuris* Church. It is the *sui iuris* Church that constitutes a juridical person, represented by the one who presides over it according to the norm of law, and not the rite.

1. Liturgical Prescriptions in CCEO and Their Observation

CCEO canon 3 states precisely that: "The Code, although it often refers to the prescriptions of liturgical books, does not for the most part legislate on liturgical matters; therefore, these norms are to be diligently observed, unless they are contrary to the canons of the Code." Given its strictly juridical nature, the CCEO does not directly regulate questions of liturgical character. It belongs, therefore, to the competent ecclesiastical authority, to regulate public divine worship according to canon 657 (cf. c. 668). The sources of canonical norms in the liturgical matters of various *sui iuris* Churches are the particular laws contained in the liturgical books, other laws, prescriptions, rules, norms, liturgical statutes, legitimate customs as well as the norms of the same CCEO, not very abundant but equally important. The CCEO, by public divine worship intends that which is done in the name of the Church by persons legitimately appointed for this and through an act approved by the authority of the Church, otherwise it is private (cf. c. 668, § 1).

The reference to the liturgy is something fundamental and constant in the CCEO (cf. above all Title XVI on divine worship and the sacraments, the sacramentals, the sacred places, feast days and days of penitence, veneration of the saints, of sacred icons and relics, and the liturgical rites for the fulfilment of some ecclesiastical acts). The CCEO refers repeatedly to "liturgical books", to the "prescriptions of the liturgical books", to "what is contained in the liturgical books", to the "liturgical laws", to the "particular law" in liturgical matters, and to "the legitimate customs" in liturgical matters. All these expressions, although they may not always have the same juridical significance, however, are inserted in the "particular law", understood in the

sense of c. 1493, § 2, that is, "all the laws, lawful customs, statutes and other norms of law which are not common to the entire Church nor to all the Eastern Churches", but to each *sui iuris* Church. The frequent reference of the Code to the laws and norms or liturgical prescriptions attributes to them greater vigour, as much as their application is really required for the application of the same canonical norms. In fact, the liturgical books of the different *sui iuris* Churches, legitimately approved, contain particular prescriptions for the order of divine worship and the celebration and administration of the sacraments and sacramentals. Here it is not a question of "liturgical rubrics", but the true liturgical order, required by the theological sense of liturgical actions.

Canon 3, therefore, establishes a general norm according to which the prescriptions of the liturgical books should be diligently observed, unless they are not contrary to the canons of the Code. It is obvious that the normative laws and customs, already existing in liturgical matters as also the reform and changes of the liturgical books, undertaken by the various catholic Eastern Churches, after the promulgation of the Code, cannot contain liturgical norms contrary to the canons of the Code. In this perspective, the CCEO confirming the teaching of Vatican II, *Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, no. 6, orders that the hierarchs who preside over *sui iuris* Churches and all other hierarchs are to see most carefully to the faithful protection and the accurate observance of their own rite and not admit changes in it except by reason of its organic progress, keeping in mind, however, mutual good will and the unity of Christians (cc. 40, 81, 657, § 4). Clerics, monks, religious and other Christian faithful are bound to observe everywhere their own rite faithfully and daily to acquire a greater understanding and a more perfect practice of it (cc. 40, §§ 2 & 3; 405).

The different *sui iuris* Churches through particular law can issue liturgical laws according to the norm of common law (c. 110, § 1). Such laws, enacted by the Synod of Bishops of the Patriarchal Church and promulgated by the patriarch, have the force of law everywhere in the world for the faithful of the same

Church (c.150 § 2). This is valid also for the major archiepiscopal Churches. The council of hierarchs of metropolitan *sui iuris* Churches can also enact laws and liturgical norms, according to the norm of law -- which the metropolitan promulgate, in those cases in which the common law remits the matter to the particular law of a *sui iuris* Church (cf. c. 167, §§ 1-3). In all other *sui iuris* Churches (which are neither patriarchal nor major archiepiscopal nor metropolitan), the hierarch who presides over it according to the norm of law, can make laws and liturgical norms with the consent of the Apostolic See, if the common law remits the matter to the particular law (cf. c. 176).

2. Norms of CCEO on Liturgical Books

The CCEO makes explicit reference to the liturgical books in the following canons: a) ecclesiastical approval of the liturgical texts and the editions of Sacred Scripture for liturgical use, cc. 655 § 3, 656 §§ 1-2, 657, §§ 1-3; b) observance of the liturgical heritage, cc. 40 §1, 657 § 4; c) observation of the prescriptions of the liturgical books, cc. 3, 75, 91, 92 §2, 135, 161, 162, 200, 209, 278 §§ 1, 3, 309, 403 §1, 462 § 2, 473 §1 674, 683, 699 §§ 2-3, 701, 704, 710, 714 § 1, 742, 836.

For liturgical purpose, only editions of the Sacred Scripture with ecclesiastical approval should be used (c. 655 § 3); in liturgical celebrations, only books with ecclesiastical approval should be used; and books of prayers or devotions intended either for the public or private use of the Christian faithful are to have ecclesiastical permission (c. 656). The approbation of liturgical texts, after a prior review of the Apostolic See, is reserved in patriarchal and major archiepiscopal Churches to the patriarch and major archbishop with the consent of the synod of bishops of their own Church; in the metropolitan *sui iuris* Churches to the Metropolitan with the consent of the council of hierarchs; in all other Churches this right rests exclusively with the Apostolic See and, within the limits set by it, to bishops and to their legitimately constituted assemblies (c. 657 § 1).

3. Liturgical Formation in CCEO

Those aspiring to the sacred ministry ought to learn to celebrate continually the divine praises according to their own rite and to nourish their spiritual life from them (cf. 346 §2,3). Among the theological disciplines that are to be taught in the major seminaries, canon 350 § 3 contains the liturgy, which "should be taught in virtue of its special importance as a necessary source of doctrine and of a true Christian spirit". Canon 352 §2 prescribes that "the students are to be instructed especially ... in the liturgical celebration". As regards the proper formation to be imparted to the deacons not destined for priesthood, canon 354 emphasizes that "of the traditions of their own *sui iuris* Church concerning the service of liturgy". Canon 591, 2 refers to the catechists and prescribes that "the formation of catechists is such that, as valid cooperators of the sacred ministers, they can fittingly discharge in the work of evangelization and in liturgical service. "In the catechetical directory the special character of the Eastern Churches is to be taken into account, so that the biblical and liturgical dimensions... are highlighted in the imparting of catechesis (c. 621 § 2).

As far as lay faithful are concerned, canon 405 explicitly exhorts them to study zealously their own liturgical patrimony. In c. 903 "the religious fidelity to the ancient traditions of the Eastern Churches", especially liturgical, is considered as an all efficacious means of fostering unity among all the Eastern Churches. Moreover canon 41 stipulates that "The Christian faithful of any *sui iuris* Church, even the Latin Church, who by reason of their office, ministry, or function have frequent dealings with the Christian faithful of another *sui iuris* Church are to have a formation in the knowledge and practice of the rite of the same Church in keeping with the importance of the office, ministry or function they hold".

4. The Patriarchs and Bishops as Custodians of the Liturgical Patrimony of Their Own Churches

By his own right the patriarch can direct instructions and encyclical letters to the Christian faithful of the entire Church over which he presides on questions of rite and for the purpose of fostering piety, correcting abuses and approving and encouraging practices which foster the spiritual welfare of the Christian faithful (c. 82 § 1, no. 2 & 3).

The bishop is the primary custodian of the liturgical patrimony of his own Church. According to canon 199 § 1, "As the moderator, promoter and guardian of the entire liturgical life in the eparchy committed to him, the eparchial bishop must be vigilant that it be fostered to the utmost and be ordered according to the prescriptions and lawful customs of his own Church *sui iuris*". Canon 201 § 2 establishes that "The eparchial bishop is to be vigilant lest abuses should creep into ecclesiastical discipline, especially concerning the ministry of the word of God, the celebration of the sacraments and sacramentals, the worship of God and the cult of saints ...". The eparchial bishop to whose care the Christian faithful of another *sui iuris* Church have been committed is bound by the serious obligation of providing everything so that these Christian faithful retain the rite of their respective Church, cherishing and observing it as far as possible (c.193 § 10). Finally, canon 415 § 1 establishes that "All religious are subject to the authority of the local hierarch in matters which pertain to the public celebration of divine worship...".

Canons 114 § 1 & 124 order the constitution of a liturgical commission in patriarchal and major archiepiscopal Churches,. Also the council of hierarchs of the metropolitan *sui iuris* Churches can establish norms for the observation of their own rite (cf. c. 169).

5. Rights and Obligations of Christian Faithful in the Liturgical Life of Their Own Church *Sui Iuris*

Canon 9 § 2 emphasizes the special care of the Church for catechumens, that "introduces them into participation in the Divine Liturgy, the sacraments and the divine praises". Someone is introduced into the catechumenate "with liturgical ceremonies" (c. 587 § 1). Canon 587 § 2 establishes that "persons who are enrolled in the catechumenate have the right to be admitted to the liturgy of the word and other liturgical celebrations not reserved to the Christian faithful". Canon 17 recognizes the right of the Christian faithful "to worship God according to the prescriptions of their own Church *sui iuris*" . According to canon 403 § 1, lay persons "have the right to participate actively in the liturgical celebrations of any *sui iuris* Church according to the norms of the liturgical books". In the field of sacramental life, as a rule, the catholic ministers are obliged to administer licitly the sacraments only to Catholic Christian faithful, who likewise, licitly receive the sacraments only from Catholic ministers (cf. 671 § 1).

Also in the field of the evangelizing function of the Church, the CCEO canon 584 § 2 recognizes that evangelization of the nations should be so done that the Gospel can be expressed also in their own liturgical rites.

6. Celebration of Divine Liturgy and Divine Praises according to the Prescriptions of the Liturgical Books of Each Church *Sui Iuris*

Canon 199 § 2 prescribes that "the eparchial bishop is to see to it that in his own cathedral at least part of the divine praises are celebrated, even daily, according to the lawful customs of his own *sui iuris* Church; also, in a parish if possible, the divine praises are to be celebrated on Sundays, feast days, principal solemnities and their vigils". According to § 3 "the eparchial bishop is to preside frequently at the divine praises in the cathedral or other church, especially on holy days of obligation, and on other solemnities in which a sizable part of the people

participate". Canon 278 § 1 no. 3 establishes that the protopresbyter has the right and duty "to see to it that the Divine Liturgy and the divine praises are celebrated according to the prescriptions of the liturgical books; that the good appearance and condition of the churches and sacred furnishings are carefully maintained especially in the celebration of the Divine Liturgy and custody of the Divine Eucharist". Canon 289 § 2 reminds the pastor that "in carrying out the function of sanctifying, the pastor is to take care that the celebration of the Divine Liturgy is the center and culmination of the whole life of the Christian community; and also to labor that the Christian faithful are fed with spiritual food through devout and frequent participation in the divine praises". Canon 309 establishes that the rector of a church must see that the Divine Liturgy, sacraments and divine praises are celebrated in the church according to the prescriptions of the liturgical books and law. Canon 473 § 1 recommends that in individual monasteries the Divine Liturgy shall be celebrated on all days except those which are excluded by the prescriptions of the liturgical books. For the monasteries in which there are no priest-monks, the local hierarch shall designate a priest who will celebrate regularly the Divine Liturgy and preach the word of God in the monastery. The superiors of monasteries and each house of orders and congregations shall take care that all the monks and religious take part daily in the divine praises and Divine Liturgy when they are celebrated (473 § 2 no. 1; 538 §§ 1&2). Canon 369 § 1 reminds the clerics to be assiduous in the liturgical celebrations.

7. Celebration and Administration of the Sacraments according to the Liturgical Patrimony of each Church

Title XVI of the CCEO carries the inscription: "The Divine Worship and Especially the Sacraments", including thus the sacraments in the divine worship, underlining "the necessity to conform to the mentality of the orientals, according to whom

the sacraments, and above all the eucharistic sacrifice, cannot be adequately distinguished from divine worship".[1]

The pneumatological dimension or the operation of the Holy Spirit is particularly emphasised in the CCEO: by the power of the Holy Spirit the Church celebrates and administers the sacraments, for the sanctification of people (c. 667); through washing with natural water and with the invocation of the name of God the Father, Son and the Holy Spirit the baptism is celebrated (c. 675 § 1); by the seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit, the baptized is anointed in the chrismation with holy myron (confirmation) (c.692); In the Divine Liturgy, by the power of the Holy Spirit there is perpetuated that which the Lord Jesus himself did at the Last Supper (c. 698); by the Holy Spirit the Christian faithful are led to the sacrament of penance (c. 718); In virtue of the working of the Holy Spirit the clerics receive the sacred ordination and are constituted sacred ministers (cc. 323 § 1; 743).

Canon 673 emphasizes the ecclesial dimension of the sacraments: "The celebration of the sacraments, above all the Divine Liturgy, as an action of the Church, in as much as it is possible, should be done with active participation of the Christian faithful".

Canon 674 underlines the obligation to observe one's own liturgical rite in the celebration of the sacraments; "In celebrating the sacraments that which is contained in the liturgical books is to be observed accurately. § 2. The minister should celebrate the sacraments according to the liturgical prescriptions of his own *sui iuris* Church, unless the law establishes otherwise or he himself has obtained a special faculty from the apostolic See.[2]

---

[1] *Nuntia* 10 (1980) 4.

[2] In the case in point, "ex concessione Summi Pontificis", it belongs to the Congregation for the Oriental Churches to grant the rescript to celebrate the Divine Liturgy and other sacraments in another rite.

7.1. Baptism

Canon 675 § 1 quotes entirely the formula used in the celebration of baptism: washing with the natural water "with the invocation of the name of God Father, Son and Holy Spirit", while canon 683 refers to the liturgical prescriptions, without giving any precise indication about the manner of the washing: "baptism must be celebrated according to the liturgical prescriptions of the Church *sui iuris* in which according to the norm of law the person to be baptized is to be enrolled". Canons 29, 30 establish the norms that regulate the ascription to a Church *sui iuris* through the reception of baptism. The Latin Code is more explicit in this point: "baptism is to be conferred either by immersion or by pouring ..." (c. 854).

7.2. Chrismation with Holy Myron

Canon 693 describes the liturgical elements of the sensible signs of the holy myron, composed of the oil of olives or other plants and aromatics, and consecrated by the bishop or the patriarch.

Canons 694 & 695 consider the joined celebration of baptism and crismation by a presbyter; canon 697 prescribes the reception of the Divine Eucharist as early as possible after baptism and chrismation with holy myron, according to the norm of particular law in liturgical matters. Canon 710 refers to the prescriptions of the liturgical books of each Church *sui iuris* with respect to the participation of infants in the Divine Eucharist after baptism and chrismation with holy myron.

7.3. Divine Eucharist

The canons of liturgical content concerning the divine Eucharist are the following:

Canon 699 §§ 2 & 3 refer to the liturgical ministry of the deacons according to the prescriptions of the liturgical books, and the participation of the lay faithful in the celebration of the Divine Liturgy in the manner determined by the liturgical books or particular law. Canon 709 determines the minister of

the most holy communion, that is, the priest or if the particular law of his own Church *sui iuris* establishes it, also the deacon; the same particular law can establish appropriate norms according to which other Christian faithful can also distribute the divine Eucharist.

Canon 700 § 2 recommends the concelebration of Divine Liturgy, that manifests the unity of priesthood and sacrifice, without prejudice to the right of each priest to celebrate individually, not however at the same time and in the same church where the celebration is taking place. Besides, canon 701 regulates the manner of celebration: the concelebrants follow all the prescriptions of the liturgical books of the main celebrant, avoiding any liturgical syncretism whatever and all preferably wearing the liturgical vestments and insignia of their own Church *sui iuris*.

Canon 704 recommends the daily celebration of the Divine Liturgy, except those days which are excluded according to the prescriptions of the liturgical books of the Church *sui iuris* in which the priest is enrolled. In the aliturgical days of Great Lent, the Liturgy of the Presanctified is celebrated (cf. c. 715 § 2).

Canon 706 refers to the gifts which are offered in the Divine Liturgy: pure wheat bread recently made and uncorrupt natural grape wine. The canon does not refer to the addition of a little water in the chalice, as witness the liturgical prescriptions of all the Eastern Churches except that of Armenian. As regards the confection of the bread (leavened or unleavened), canon 707 § 1 orders that the norms established by the particular law of each Church *sui iuris* must be observed. Equally concerning the preparation for participation in the Divine Eucharist through fast, prayers and other works, the Christian faithful are to observe everywhere the prescriptions of the liturgical books (c. 713 § 2).

The Divine Eucharist is distributed in the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, unless a just cause suggests otherwise (713 § 1). In churches where there is public divine worship, the Divine Eucharist is to be reserved especially for the sick, and also is to be adored with the greatest reverence by the Christian faithful,

observing faithfully the prescriptions of the liturgical books of the respective Church *sui iuris* (c. 714 § 1).

Canon 715 admits that it is lawful for priests to receive the offerings which the Christian faithful give for celebrating the Divine Liturgy for their intentions. It is also permissible, if it is thus established by lawful custom, to receive offerings for the Liturgy of the Presanctified and for the commemorations in the Divine Liturgy. According to canon 1013 § 1 the eparchial bishop fixes the amount of the taxes for the offerings made on the occasion of the celebration of the Divine Liturgy, of the sacraments, of the sacramentals and of any other liturgical celebration.

The code emphasizes the importance of homily in the Divine Liturgy. Canon 607 recommends that "the celebration of the word of God is to be constantly fostered" especially "the liturgical homily". Canon 614 establishes: § 1. The homily, in which during the course of the liturgical year the mysteries of the faith and the norms of Christian living are expounded from Sacred Scripture, is strongly recommended as part of the liturgy itself. § 2. Parish priests and rectors of churches have the obligation to take care that a homily is preached at least during the Divine Liturgy on Sundays and holy days of obligation. It is not to be omitted except for a grave reason. § 3. Parish priests are not allowed to have habitually a substitute to discharge their duty of preaching to the people committed to their pastoral care except for a just reason approved by the local hierarch. § 4. The homily is reserved to a priest or, according to norm of particular law, also to a deacon.

Canon 92 prescribes that the patriarch must commemorate the Roman Pontiff in the Divine Liturgy and in the divine praises (in the liturgy of the hours) according to the prescriptions of the liturgical books. "The patriarch must be commemorated in the Divine Liturgy and in the divine praises after the Roman Pontiff by all the bishops and other clerics according to the prescriptions of the liturgical books (c.91). This is valid also for major archbishop and for a metropolitan who presides over a metropolitan Church *sui iuris* (cf. cc. 152,

161, 162). Also, "the eparchial bishop must commemorate the Roman Pontiff before all as a sign of full communion with him in the Divine Liturgy and the divine praises according to the prescriptions of the liturgical books and to see to it that it be faithfully done by the other clergy of the eparchy. The eparchial bishop must be commemorated by all the clergy in the Divine Liturgy and the divine praises according to the prescriptions of the liturgical books" (c. 209).

"The patriarch must celebrate the Divine Liturgy for the people of the entire Church over which he presides on feast days established by particular law (c.94). "With regard to prayers and pious exercises, provided that they are consonant with his own rite, the patriarch can do the same as the local hierarch in the entire Church over which he presides" (c.96). The eparchial bishop is to celebrate the Divine Liturgy frequently for the people of the eparchy entrusted to him; he must celebrate on the days prescribed by the particular law of his own Church *sui iuris* (c.198). "It is for the eparchial bishop to celebrate sacred functions in the entire eparchy. These he must conduct solemnly according to the prescriptions of the liturgical books, vested in all pontifical insignia ..." (c.200). Also the pastor is frequently to celebrate the Divine Liturgy for the people of the parish entrusted to him but is bound to celebrate it for them on the days prescribed by the particular law of his Church *sui iuris* (c. 294).

7.4. Penitence

Canon 719 recommends to the Christian faithful, who are conscious of serious sin, to receive the sacrament of penance "especially during the times of fasts and penance observed in their own Church *sui iuris*".

7.5. Anointing of the Sick

Canon 737 § 2 recommends to the Churches that have the custom of administering the sacrament of the anointing of the sick by several priests together, to conserve this custom. Canon 741 establishes that the oil for the use in the sacrament of

anointing the sick is to be blessed by the priest himself who administers the sacrament, unless the particular law of his Church *sui iuris* stipulates otherwise. As regards the order and manner of anointing to be carried out in this sacrament, canon 742 orders to follow the prescriptions of the liturgical books.

7.6. Sacred Ordination

Canon 773 recommends that the sacred ordinations should be celebrated on Sunday or a feast day, so that the greatest number of Christian faithful can participate. Canon 327 refers to the particular law of each Church *sui iuris* about the regulation of the minor orders and their liturgical functions. In order that a person is to be ordained licitly, he requires the reception of the lower orders according to the norm of the particular law of each Church *sui iuris* (c. 758 § 1, no. 5). However, "if the necessity of the Church and genuine advantage so recommend, and when sacred ministers are lacking, certain functions of the sacred ministers may be committed to lay persons, according to the norms of law (403 § 2).

7.7. Marriage

Canon 782 § 1 refers to the particular law of the respective Church *sui iuris* the regulation of engagements which precede the marriage. Canon 823 requires the "sacred rite" for the valid celebration of marriage. This rite consists of the intervention of a priest who assists and blesses. Practically the form of celebration of marriage coincides with the liturgical celebration. Canon 836 prescribes that in the celebration of marriage the prescriptions of the liturgical books and the lawful customs are to be observed. According to canon 834 § 2 the benediction of a priest is required for the valid celebration of mixed marriage between a catholic faithful and a non Catholic Eastern Christian. Canon 834 § 2 permits the particular law of each Church *sui iuris* to establish norms concerning the time of the celebration of marriage.

8. Celebration and Administration of the Sacramentals according to the Liturgical Heritage of each Church

The canons concerning the sacramentals, sacred times and places, the veneration of saints, vows and oaths are inserted in Title XVI on *Divine Worship and especially the Sacraments,* since they deal with acts of non sacramental liturgical cult.

Canon 867 describes the notion of sacramentals, restating in part one the formulation of the constitution SC 60, according to which "The holy mother Church has, moreover, instituted sacramentals. These are sacred signs which bear a resemblance to the sacraments. They signify effects, particularly of a spiritual nature, which are obtained through the Church's intercession. By them men are disposed to receive the chief effects of the sacraments, and various occasions in life are rendered holy". The relationship between sacramentals and sacraments consists in a certain imitation that exists in the sacred signs of the sacramentals with respect to the signs of the sacraments. The sacramentals are not things (*res*) and actions (*actiones*), but *sacred signs, liturgical signs* of divine grace. "Thus for well-disposed members of the faithful the liturgy of the sacraments and sacramentals sanctifies almost every event of their lives with the divine grace which flows from the paschal mystery of the passion, death and resurrection of Christ. From this source all sacraments and sacramentals draw their power"(SC 61). While the sacraments are instituted by Christ, the sacramentals are instituted by the Church. The Church through her praying and interceding liturgical faith, sanctifies the life of the faithful and disposes them for the reception of the principal effect of sacraments.

The second part of the canon prescribes that concerning the sacramentals the norms of particular law of the respective Church *sui iuris* are to be observed. In fact, in the oriental Churches the number of sacramentals is very vast. The rite of their celebration and administration is prescribed in the liturgical books.

8.1. Dedication of Sacred Places

Canon 869 defines the place of a church as a building exclusively dedicated for divine worship by consecration or blessing, obviously according to the prescriptions of the liturgical books. According to canon 871, the cathedral churches, parish churches, churches of monasteries and churches attached to religious houses should be dedicated through consecration by the eparchial bishop. The consecration of churches and altars is effected by the anointing with chrism. The eparchial bishop cannot grant the faculty of such consecration to a presbyter, neither in exceptional cases, because "it is not acceptable to the Orient that who is not bestowed with episcopal consecration can consecrate the churches".[3] As regards other private oratories the dedication takes place in general with the benediction according to the liturgical books.

Also the Christian cemetries are sacred places, destined for the burial of deceased Christians; the cemeteries and the tombs in the occasion of funeral rites, become sacred places through the benediction according to the liturgical books (c. 874 § 2). They are venerated by the Christian faithful from the very first years of Christianity, especially the tombs of the holy martyrs. In the cemetries the Church not only remembers the dead, but professes the faith in the resurrection of the dead.

8.2. Feast Days and Days of Penance

As we have already said, canon 704 establishes that "The Divine Liturgy can be praiseworthily celebrated on any day except those which are excluded according to the prescriptions of the liturgical books of the Church *sui iuris* in which the priest is enrolled". In the Byzantine Churches, in the aliturgical days the Liturgy of the Presanctified is celebrated.

Canons 880-883 deal with feast days and days of penance and repeat for the most part the norms established by the conciliar decree *Orientalium Ecclesiarum* (OE) on feast days,

---

[3] *Nuntia* 28 (1989) 120.

obligatory feasts and sacred times, adding some norms on days of penance.

Canon 880 §§ 1 & 2 conforms to the conciliar decree OE, which establishes that "For the future the setting up, transfer or suppression of feast days common to all the Eastern Churches is reserved solely to an ecumenical council or the Apostolic See. On the other hand, the setting up, transfer and suppression of feast days for any of the particular Churches is within the competence not only of the Apostolic See but also of patriarchal or archiepiscopal synods, due regard being had for the whole area affected as also for the other particular Churches". Part three of canon 880 establishes the feast days of obligation besides Sundays, common to all the Eastern Churches (Christmas, the Epiphany, the Ascension, the Dormition of Holy Mary the Mother of God and the holy apostles Peter and Paul), without prejudice to the particular law of a Church *sui iuris* approved by the Apostolic See by which certain holidays of obligation are suppressed or transferred to a Sunday. However in the emanation of this particular law, it is necessary to see most carefully to the faithful protection and accurate observance of their own rite and not admit changes in it except by reason of its organic progress (cf. c.40 § 1). The suppression of the feast days of obligation would be contrary to the sacred liturgical tradition of the Eastern Churches. The transfer of feast days of obligation to Sunday would be contrary to the specific theological sense of the same feast days and of the Sunday itself, day of the Lord; besides, the eventual transfer of some feast days of obligation to Sunday, though justified by pastoral reasons, is not in conformity with the structure of the liturgical year. But since in many Eastern Churches most of these feasts last for many days, it would be preferable to preserve the feasts on their respective days, and at the same time, solemnize them on the Sunday during which the feast is celebrated.

Concerning the celebration of Easter, the conciliar decree OE 20 establishes: "Until all Christians agree, as is hoped, on one day for the celebration of Easter by all, in the meantime as a means of fostering unity among Christians who live in the same

area or country it is left to the patriarchs or to the supreme ecclesiastical authorities of the place to consult all parties involved and so come to an unanimous agreement to celebrate the feast of Easter on the same Sunday.[4]

Canon 881 § 1 prescribes the obligation of the Christian faithful to participate, on Sundays and feast days in the Divine Liturgy or according to the prescriptions or legitimate customs of their own Church *sui iuris*, in the celebration of the divine praises. The immediate source of this canon is the conciliar decree OE 15: "The faithful are obliged to take part in the Divine Liturgy on Sundays and feast days or, according to the regulations or custom of their own rite, in the celebration of the Divine Office". It is noted in merit of the fact that, "in some regions all the Orientals consider the participation in the Divine Liturgy obligatory on Sundays and feast days. The non Catholic Orientals also admit this in practice. To mention in the common code that there is an alternative between the Divine Liturgy and the divine office would create great confusion and eventually would lead the faithful to adopt the easier way. The participation in the Divine Liturgy would be gradually abandoned in a large measure. The *Coetus de expensione observationum* has replied that "provision is made for this with the clause 'according to the prescriptions or legitimate customs of their own Church *sui iuris*".[5] Obviously the Divine Liturgy is the source and summit of Christian spiritual life and has a superior value:

> By tradition handed down from the apostles, which took its origin from the very day of Christ's resurrection, the Church celebrates the paschal mystery every seventh day, which day is appropriately called the Lord's Day or Sunday. For on this day Christ's faithful are bound to come together into one place. They should listen to the word of God and take part in the Eucharist, thus calling to mind the passion, resurrection, and glory of the Lord Jesus, and giving thanks to God

[4] Cf. also SC appendix: Declaration of the Ecumenical Council Vatican II about the reform of calendar.

[5] *Nuntia*, 28 (1989) 122.

> who 'has begotten them again, through the resurrection of Christ from the dead, unto a living hope' (1 Pet. 1: 3). The Lord's day is the original feast day, and it should be proposed to the faithful and taught to them so that it may become in fact a day of joy and of freedom from work. Other celebrations, unless they be truly of the greatest importance, shall not have precedence over Sunday, which is the foundation and kernel of the whole liturgical year" (SC 106).

However the CCEO. preserving the alternative of participation of Christian faithful in the celebration of the divine praises, intends to underscore that also the celebration of the divine praises has its specific value for Christian life. In many oriental Churches, imitating the practice of the Latin Church, the divine praises have almost disappeared in the parishes and the Mass substitutes the whole liturgical life; and thus has been lost a true equilibrium, creating a real impoverishment of liturgical life.

Part two of canon 881, restating textually OE 15, determines the available time to fulfil more easily this obligation, which extends from Vespers of the vigil to the end of the Sunday or feast day. This arrangement is new at least where is in vigour the obligation to participate in the Divine Liturgy, and is in conformity with the notion of liturgical day in the Orient. The norm does not authorize to celebrate the Divine Liturgy on the vigil of the Sunday or feast day.

Part three, repeating textually OE 15, warmly recommends the Christian faithful to receive the Divine Eucharist on these days and indeed more frequently, even daily. Thus the attention of the Christian faithful is recalled to the opportunity of receiving the Divine Eucharist on each feast.[6]

According to canon 882, "On the days of penance the Christian faithful are obliged to observe fast or abstinence in the manner established by the particular law of their Church *sui iuris*". The days of penitence imply the observation of fast or abstinence in the manner established by the particular law of the

---

[6] *Nuntia* 28 (1989) 122.

relative Church *sui iuris*. Concerning the days of penitence and the significance of fast, ancient canonical norms are very vast which underline the spirit of spiritual purification through the psychosomatic mortification.

As we have already said, canon 40 § 3 establishes that "the Christian faithful [...] are bound to observe their own rite everywhere unless something is excused by the law. In fact canon 883 admits an exception and restates textually the words of the conciliar decree OE 21, according to which "individual faithful who live outside the area or territory of their own rite may follow in all points the discipline in force in the place where they are living. In families of mixed rite this law may be observed according to one and the same rite".

8.3. Veneration of the Saints, Sacred Icons or Images and Relics

Canon 884 underlines the importance of the veneration of the Mother of God and the saints for the sanctification of the people of God. In the liturgical worship

> the Eastern Christians pay high tribute, in beautiful hymns of praise, to Mary ever Virgin, whom the ecumenical synod of Ephesus solemnly proclaimed to be the holy Mother of God in order that Christ might be truly and properly acknowledged as Son of God and Son of Man, according to the Scriptures. They also give homage to the saints, among them the Fathers of the universal Church (UR 15).

"The authentic cult of the saints does not consist so much in a multiplicity of external acts, but rather in a more intense practice of our love, whereby, for our own greater good and that of the Church, we seek from the saints' example in their way of life, fellowship in their communion, and the help of their intercession ... our communion with these in heaven, provided that it is understood in the full light of faith, in no way diminishes the worship of adoration given to God the Father, through Christ, in the Spirit; on the contrary, it greatly enriches it" (LG 51).

Canon 665 § 1 recommends the pastors and rectors of churches to be watchful in their churches so as not to display, sell, or distribute icons or images that are not in keeping with genuine sacred art or that do not conform, obviously to the proper liturgical and spiritual tradition.

In the Church, according to the tradition, the saints are venerated and their feasts proclaim the wonderful works of Christ in his servants and offer to the faithful fitting examples of their imitation (cf. SC 111). With the divine public cult (done in the name of the Church by a person legitimately appointed for this and through an act approved by the authority of the Church) are venerated according to canon 885 only those servants of God who are listed by the authority of the Church among the saints or the blessed. "In the East those servants of God who are canonically inscribed among the blessed, are also venerated with public cult among the Saints, under many distinctions seen accurately in the liturgical books".[7]

Concerning the sacred icons, canon 886 confirms the practice of the Eastern Churches to propose the veneration of sacred icons to the Christian faithful, in the manner and order established by the particular law of each Church *sui iuris*. The seventh ecumenical council of Nicaea (787), condemning the heresy of Iconoclasm, has justified the cult of icons. In the dogmatic definition, the Fathers of the council affirm among other things: "... we declare that we defend free from any innovations all the written and unwritten ecclesiastical traditions that have been entrusted to us. One of these is the production of representational art; this is quite in harmony with the history of the spread of the gospel, as it provides confirmation that the becoming man of the Word of God was real and not just imaginary, and as it brings us a similar benefit. For, things that mutually illustrate one another undoubtedly possess one another's message [...]. like the figure of the honoured and life-giving cross, the revered and holy images, whether printed or made of mosaic or of other suitable material, are to be exposed

[7] *Nuntia* 10 (1980) 16 & 63; 24-25 (1987) 158: c. 881.

in the holy churches of God, on sacred instruments and vestments, on walls and panels, in houses and by public ways; these are the images of our Lord, God and saviour, Jesus Christ, and of our Lady without blemish, the holy God-bearer, and of the revered angels and of any of the saintly holy men. The more frequently they are seen in representational art, the more those who see them are drawn to remember and long for those who serve as models, and to pay these images the tribute of salutation and respectful veneration. Certainly this is not the full adoration in accordance with our faith, which is properly paid only to the divine nature, but it resembles that given to the figure of the honoured and life-giving cross, and so to the holy books of the gospels and to other sacred cult objects. Further, people are drawn to honour these images with the offering of incense and lights, as was piously established by ancient custom. Indeed, the honour paid to an image traverses it, reaching the model; and he who venerates the image, venerates the person represented in that image".[8] The same ecumenical council, in the third anathema, prescribes as regards the sacred images: "If anyone does not salute such representations as standing for the Lord and his saints, let him be anathema".[9] From this text results, however, that the Christian cult of the sacred icons or images is not contrary to the first commandment which condemns idolatry, and is founded on the mystery of incarnation of the Word of God. The honour attributed to the sacred icons or images is a devout veneration, not an adoration which is due to God alone. The sacred icons or images are not venerated in themselves, but as far as they serve to represent God incarnate, that is as far as they belong to the adoration of God, the veneration of the mother of God and the saints. "The honour given to an icon belongs to the one who is there represented".[10] It is really for this reason that, according to a pious custom, the Eastern faithful who acquire an icon for their personal piety and veneration, give

---

[8] *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta,* Bologna 1991, 135-136.

[9] Ibid., 137.

[10] San Basilio, *Liber de Spiritu Sancto* 18, 45: PG 32, 149 C.

it first to the priest in order to be "dedicated" or "consecrated" on the altar.

As regards the sacred relics, canon 888 § 1 orders that they shall not be objects of commerce. Therefore, it is absolutely unlawful to sell them. In the Church, according to the tradition, the authentic relics of saints are venerated and held in honour (SC 111). The sacred relics, especially those of the martyrs, besides being venerated, are deposited during the consecration of churches. Canon seven of the council of Nicaea II (787) prescribes that: "Just as those heretics removed the sight of venerable icons from the church, they also abandoned other customs, which should now be renewed and which should be in vigour in virtue of both written and unwritten legislation. Therefore, we decree that in venerable churches consecrated without relics of the holy martyrs, the installation of relics should take place along with the usual prayers. And if in the future any bishop is found out consecrating a church without relics, let him be deposed as someone who has flouted the ecclesiastical traditions".[11]

9. Other Norms of Liturgical Nature in CCEO

Also the proclamation and enthronement of the patriarch should be done according to the prescriptions of the liturgical books (c. 75). According to canon 60 § 1, in churches which are designated for the Christian faithful of the Church over which he presides and in liturgical celebrations of the same Church, a patriarch precedes other patriarchs. According to canon 62, a patriarch who has resigned from his office retains his title and honours especially during liturgical celebrations. Concerning monastic profession, canon 462 § 2 orders that the prescriptions of the liturgical books shall be observed.

---

[11] *Conciliorum Oecumenicorum Decreta*, Bologna 1991, 145.

Conclusion

All these norms of liturgical nature demonstrate that the *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches* confirms and preserves the liturgical patrimony of the Eastern Churches. The liturgical tradition is part of the sacred heritage of each Church *sui iuris*, with which is manifested its own manner of professing, celebrating and living the faith. In this patrimony shines forth the tradition which has come from the Apostles through the Fathers and which affirms the divine unity in the truth of the Catholic faith.

English translation
Alex Koonthanam

CONCLUSION

In the beginning of this book we asked two questions: what makes a Church? What is the most basic element of a Church? As exposed in the first article, the most basic principle of Orthodox ecclesiology can be crystallized in the axiom "the Eucharist makes the Church". According to the Orthodox mind, wherever there is the Eucharist, there is the Church in its fullness as the Body of Christ. The eucharistic assembly under the presidency of the bishop is the Church in its fullness possessing all the *notae Ecclesiae* of the true Church of God: unity, holiness, catholicity and apostolicity. Therefore, we can say that Eucharist makes the Church. But the Orthodox theologians do not seem to shed light on the ecclesiological dimension of other sacraments, especially baptism and confirmation which in unity with the Eucharist form the sacraments of initiation and by which one becomes a member of the Church. Though the Eucharist is the 'sacrament of the sacraments' and the root and foundation of Church life, and all other sacraments are ultimately oriented to the Eucharist, the other sacraments also contribute to the realization of the Church in their own manner.

We have seen in the second article "The Liturgy Makes the Church: Towards a Catholic Sacramental Ecclesiology" that the Church originated from the new covenant which Jesus established by the first celebration of the Eucharist during the Last Supper and ratified by his selfless self-offering on the cross and his glorious resurrection. The methodology of the formation of a Church according to the testimony of the Acts and the recent magisterium of the Church is the celebration of the liturgy of the Word and the liturgy of the sacraments. Preaching of the Word of God, namely the proclamation of the mysteries of salvation culminated in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, generates faith and conversion. Those who believe in Jesus Christ receive the sacraments of initiation, namely baptism, confirmation and the Holy Eucharist; and thus a

Christian community or a new local Church comes into being. This local Church is further edified and nourished by the assiduous hearing of the word and the continuous celebration of the Divine Liturgy and the sacraments. The internal essential divine nature of the Church cannot be effected by canonical institutions nor by organizational structures, but only by the celebration of liturgy. In other words, a non-Christian community becomes Christian by the liturgy of the word and the liturgy of the sacraments. This is the principle operative in the Church from the very day of Pentecost and no other method is known to the Church for the formation of a Christian community.

According to Vatican II and the predominant post conciliar magisterium, Church is a communion in the vertical (communion with God) and the horizontal (communion among the faithful) levels. Such a communion can be effected only by the liturgy, namely by the Holy Eucharist and other sacraments. In the liturgical community, the triune God is present in a special manner and the faithful enter into direct communion with God, especially in the reception of the Eucharist. All the faithful who share in the same body of Christ and the same blood of Christ, become one "even as we are one" (Jn. 11, 11) and really become the body of Christ, namely the Church. In short, liturgy makes the Church.

The article "Church as Tradition" also confirms that the Church is a communion of the faithful with the triune God and among themselves which is realized in the eucharistic celebration: "The eucharistic celebration makes the church. It is here that she becomes one body in union with her own Head, the risen Lord (1 Cor 10:17). It is here that we see revealed the communitarian nature of the Church; Christ the head and Church the mystical body are concretely manifested in the worship; the heavenly and the earthly ones are united to render *eucharistia*; past, present and future become one present. In short, the Eucharist makes the Church where the Spirit of the risen Lord fashions the Church into the body of Christ" (p. 97).

Liturgy is the epiphany and crystallization of faith and the *locus theologicus* par excellence of the Church. The whole Economy of salvation, culminated in the Christ event, namely in the birth, life, passion, death, resurrection, ascension, and Pentecost, and other doctrines of Christian faith are epiphanized, celebrated, experienced, proclaimed and lived in the liturgical celebration of the Church and in the whole ensemble of the liturgical year. Similarly the eschatological advent of Christ in glory, the transformation of the world, the eternal life of man and the final convergence of everything in Christ are nowhere else better expressed than in the liturgical year and in the Rite of Christian burial. "Thus every liturgical celebration and the whole ensemble of the liturgical year is a confession of truth which God has revealed to the Church through Jesus Christ. It is because of this reality that the texts of the liturgy embody the inviolable rule of faith and that the axiom *legem credendi statuat lex supplicandi* has its origin and meaning" (p. 113). Therefore "we should approach the liturgical books as if they were the Church's theological manuals" (p.108).

Similarly spirituality is also liturgical. The purpose of spirituality is the sanctification or divinization of man and his consequent union with the most Holy Trinity. Liturgy and especially the sacraments are the means instituted by Jesus Christ for the same purpose. We hear very often about different schools of spirituality such as Franciscan spirituality, Carmelite spirituality, Ignatian spirituality, etc.; but there is fundamentally only one spirituality, the spirituality of the Church, namely liturgical spirituality. As we have seen in the article "Liturgy and Spiritual Life" or "Liturgical Spirituality?", the basic ground from which the characteristics and/or the peculiarities of each single spirituality grow constitutes the proper liturgico-sacramentarian spirituality of each faithful (cf. p.138). Every truly Christian spirituality has its source and summit in the liturgico- sacramentarian reality; the Christian spiritual life is handed down to us, develops, matures, and arrives at perfection, above all through and by means of liturgy; and the vitality present in every Christian spirituality can be reduced to a tonality

and modality to live what liturgically and what is produced by it (cf. p. 145). Therefore, no true Christian spirituality can exist without the liturgy.

As proposed in the article "Church *Sui Iuris,* Ethos and Moral Theology", each Church has the possibility of its own ethos and moral theology based on the socio-cultural philosophical heritage of the people, but in harmony with the Gospel and Christian faith. Such an ethos also contributes to the specific identity and individuality of a Church within the Catholic communion.

Canon law is also related to liturgy. The purpose of canon law and the proper canonical organization of the Church is the formation of a worshipping community for the *salus animarum* and the glorification of the triune God - Father, Son and Holy Spirit. Since liturgy is entrusted to the Church by Jesus Christ, the Church has also the right and obligation to regulate liturgy through canonical norms in accordance with the tradition and heritage of each Church (cf. pp. 179-202); however private individuals have no right to mutilate nor modify the liturgy according to their own whimsical ideas and fancies.

The patrimony or heritage of a Church includes mainly liturgy, theology, spirituality and discipline. But as we have seen, theology and spirituality are essentially liturgical. Canonical discipline is also oriented to the formation of a liturgical community for the salvation of man and the glorification of God. Therefore liturgy, is the most basic element of a Church. So the maturity or greatness of a Church cannot be determined by counting heads or institutions and administrative systems alone, as in a political party, but primarily by evaluating the intensity and quality of liturgical life.

In the introduction I have pointed out some problems involved in the definition of Church *sui iuris* as appeared in the new Oriental Code. In light of all that we have seen thus far, we arrive at the following natural conclusion: whatever be the reasons, a Church cannot be defined or described from the juridical perspective alone excluding its most basic element, namely the liturgy which brings a Church into being and

constitutes its internal essential divine nature, and other important elements like theology and spirituality which together form the distinctive identity and heritage of a Church. A multi-dimensional and multi-disciplinary approach (not only juridical) is absolutely necessary to unfold the complex reality of a Church. Considering all these aspects and in harmony with the conciliar notion of *Ecclesia particularis,* a *sui iuris* Church may be described as a community of Christian faithful constituted by liturgy (word and sacraments) which has a theological, spiritual and disciplinary heritage steeped in its own culture and circumstances of history, and which is served by a hierarchy according to the norm of law and recognized by the supreme authority of the universal Church as a patriarchal, major archiepiscopal or metropolitan *sui iuris* Church.

Paul Pallath

OUR AUTHORS

BASILIO PETRÀ, born in Arezzo (Italy) in 1964 of Greek parents, is a priest in the diocese of Prato. Having graduated in philosophy (Università di Firenze, 1971), he received his doctorate in moral theology from *Accademia Alfonsiana,* Rome in 1981. He studied one year (1976/1977) at the Holy Cross School of (Greek Orthodox) Theology (Brooklyn, Boston, USA) and one semester (1977-1978) at the Faculty of Theology of the University of Salonico (Greece). At present he is a professor of fundamental moral theology and ethics of marriage at the Florentine Theological School and a visiting professor of Greek Patristic Moral Theology at the *Accademia Alfonsiana* and Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome. He is a collaborator for numerous journals and has translated essays and books of Orthodox theologians Ch. Yannaras, G. Mantzarides and S.S. Harakas. His publications include: *Providenza e vita morale nel pensiero di Basilio il Grande,* Roma 1983; *Tra cielo e terra. Introduzione alla teologia ortodossa contemporanea,* Bologna 1992; *La coscienza "nello Spirito". Per una comprensione cristiana della coscienza morale,* Milano 1993.

CUTHBERT JOHNSON, OSB was born in England in 1946. He was professed as a Benedictine monk at Quarr Abbey on the Isle of Wight in 1966. He obtained a doctorate in Sacred Liturgy with a study on Abbot Prosper Guèranger. He is an accomplished musician and writes on monastic and liturgical subjects. Since 1983 he is an Official of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments. He is the author of many books and inumerable articles. His main works include:*Prosper Guéranger (1805-1875) A Liturgical Theologian, An Introduction to his Writings and Work,* Pontificio Istituto Sant'Anselmo, Rome 1984; *Planning for Liturgy,* St Michael's Abbey Press, Farnborough 1984; "Fontes Liturgici. Sources of the Roman Missal: I. Advent, Christmas", in

Notitiae 23 (1986) 440-747 (in collaboration with Anthony Ward); "Fontes Liturgici. Sources of the Roman Missal: Prefaces", in *Notitiae* 24 (1987) 409-1010 (in collaboration with Anthony Ward); *Dom Guéranger et le Renouveau Liturgique,* Téqui, Paris 1988; *The Prefaces of the Roman Missal: A Source Compendium with Concordance and Indices,* Congregation for Divine Worship, Rome 1989 (in collaboration with Anthony Ward); *Progetto Liturgico CLV,* Roma 1992; *Missale Romanum anno 1962 promulgatum:* Reimpressio introductione et tabulis aucta, Roma 1994 (coeditor); *Missale Parisiense anno 1738* publici iuris factum: Reimpressio introductione et tabulis aucta (coeditor), *Orbis Liturgicus: In Tempore Hodierno: Repertorium Peritorium Re Liturgica,* Rome 1995 (coauthor).

DIMITRI SALACHAS was born in 1939. He is a priest of the Byzantine Apostolic Exarchate of Athens. Holding doctorate in Byzantine Ecclesiastical Law and Civil Law, he teaches Oriental Canon Law at the Pontifical Gregorian University, Pontifical Urban University, Pontifical Angelicum University and Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome. He is a consultor to the Pontifical Council for the Interpretation of Legislative Texts, to the Congregation for the Oriental Churches and to the Pontifical Council for Christian Unity and a member of the International Commission for the dialogue between the Catholic and Orthodox Churches. He is the author of *Istituzioni di diritto canonico delle Chiese cattoliche orientali, L'iniziazione cristiana nei Codici orientale e occidentale* and *Il Sacramento del Matrimonio nel nuovo diritto canonico delle Chiese orientali,* and of many articles published in various periodicals.

EDWARD G. FARRUGIA, SJ was born on October 1, 1947, in Marsa, Malta. He joined the Society of Jesus on October 1, 1963. After the preliminary studies he enrolled in St Louis university, St Louis, Missouri, where he obtained a doctorate in philosophy in 1972. His basic studies in theology began in 1973 at Innsbruck, where Karl Rahner was one of his teachers. After ordination on July 31, 1976 Farrugia continued his studies

and proceeded to Tübingen the following year. He fulfilled all requirements for his doctorate in theology in July 1981, obtaining the degree when he published his dissertation *Aussage und Zusage* (Rome 1985). He is currently an ordinary professor of dogmatic theology and Eastern patrology at the Pontifical Institute of Oriental Studies, but teaches also at the Gregorian University, Rome, at the University of Malta and at the University in Innsbruck. He is the author of many books and inumerable articles.

JOSEPH POWATHIL was born on August 14, 1930 in Kurumpanadom into a highly respected family of ancient Christian tradition. He has degrees of Bachelor of Arts (St Berchman's College, Changanacherry), Master of Arts (Loyola College, Madras) and later the Diploma in Economic Development (University of Oxford). He holds Licentiates in Philosophy and Sacred Theology. He was ordained a priest on October 3, 1962, was Professor of Economic Science at St Berchman's College, became auxiliary Bishop on January 8, 1972, Bishop of Kanjirapally on February 26, 1977 and Metropolitan-Archbishop of Changanacherry on November 23, 1985. Mar Joseph Powathil has special concern for catechetical, theological and liturgical formation of the faithful. He has written extensively on subjects such as ecclesiology, liturgy, social teachings of the Church and education. Besides *Jeevitham Mathrusabhayodothu* [*To Live is to Live with the Mother Church*], ed. J. Muthanattu, Denha Services 22 (Kottayam, 1988), pp.xv+219 and *Sabha Samoohathil* [*Church in the World]*, ed. J. Kochuparampil, St Joseph's Orphanage Book Stall (Changanacherry, 1994), pp.xxvi+463, two other books are in print. Mar Joseph Powathil is also at present a member of the Permanent Synod of the Syro-Malabar Archiepiscopal Church, a member of Vatican Delegation for Dialogue with the Orthodox and Jacobite Churches of India, President of the Catholic Bishops' Conference of India (CBCI), Chairman of the Kerala Catholic Bishops' Council (KCBC), Chairman of the Inter Church Council for Education (an ecumenical assembly) and Chairman

of the Religious Fellowship Foundation (an inter-religious forum). He is also an honorary member of *Pro-Oriente* (Vienna) and Nilackal Ecumenical Trust (Kerala).

PAUL PALLATH was born in 1959 to a traditional Catholic family of St. Thomas Christians (Syro-Indian Church) in Kerala, India. After obtaining the degrees of B.Ph. (Bachelor of Philosophy) and B. Th. (Bachelor of Theology) from the Pontifical Institute of Theology & Philosophy, Alwaye, he was ordained a priest for the diocese of Palai in 1987. In 1994 he obtained a doctorate in Canon Law from the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome. At present he is working on another doctorate at the Pontifical Lateran University, Rome. He is the author of the books *The Synod of Bishops of Catholic Oriental Churches,* Rome 1994 and *Catholic Eastern Churches: Heritage and Identity* (edited), Rome 1994, and of many articles in Malayalam and English in the journals of India.

TRIACCA ACHILLE MARIA, SDB was born in Varese (North Italy) in 1935. After his formation at the Archiepiscopal seminary, Milan, he studied philosophy and theology at the Pontifical Salesian University, Rome. In 1968 he obtained a doctorate in liturgy with a study on Ambrosian Liturgy, from *Pontificio Istituto Liturgico S. Anselmo,* Rome. In 1985 he received honorary doctorate in Orthodox theology from *Saint-Serge*, Paris. He teaches dogmatic sacramentarian theology at the Pontifical Salesian University, liturgical theology of the non-Roman Western liturgies at *Pontificio Istituto Liturgico S. Anselmo,* and liturgical spirituality at the Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome. He alone or together with others directed and published 50 books. His most important contribution may be *Nuovo Dizionario di Liturgia* (edited with D. SARTORE). Moreover, he is the author of five hundred articles.